

1

2

3

4

5

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

6

GOING-TO-THE-SUN ROAD ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

7

PURSUANT TO THE

8

FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

GROUSE MOUNTAIN LODGE

HIGHWAY 93 & FAIRWAY DRIVE, MONTANA

20

WHITEFISH, MONTANA

21

22

23

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2001

24

8:00 A.M. to 4:40 P.M.

25

1 A P P E A R A N C E S

2 ADVISORY COMMITTEE COORDINATORS:

3 Mary Ansotegui Glacier National Park
 4 Dayna Hudson Glacier National Park
 5 Deb Hervol Glacier National Park

6 ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

7 Linda Anderson Executive Director Glacier Country
 Regional Tourism Commission - Bigfork, MT
 8 Brian Baker Waterton Lakes National Park
 Tourism Operator - Alberta, Canada
 9 Roscoe Black Owner St. Mary Lodge and Resort -
 St. Mary, MT
 10 Joni Stewart Glacier Action Involvement Now -
 Cut Bank, MT
 11 Susie Burch Owner Glacier Park Boat Company -
 Kalispell, MT
 12 Bill Dakin Realtor - Columbia Falls, MT
 David Jackson Economist - University of Montana
 School of Forestry - Missoula, MT
 13 Tony Jewett Regional Director for National
 Parks Conservation Association - Helena, MT
 Jayne Kremenik Alberta Community Development -
 14 Alberta, Canada
 Tom McDonald Salish Kootenai Tribes - Pablo, MT
 15 Lowell Meznarch Glacier County Commissioner - Cut
 Bank, MT
 16 Anna Marie Moe Industry & Operations Manager -
 Travel Montana - Helena, MT
 17 Randy Ogle (Committee Chairman)
 Attorney - OGLE & WORM - Kalispell, MT
 18 Barney O'Quinn Engineer - ARCADIS, Geraghty &
 Miller - Fuquay-Varina, North Carolina
 19 Barbara Pahl Regional Director Mountain/Plains
 Office of National Trust for Preservation - Denver, CO
 20 Don White Blackfeet Tribe - Browning, MT

21

22 COURT REPORTER:

23 Bambi Goodman, CSR, RPR, CRR Goodman Reporting,
 Whitefish, MT

24

25

1 A P P E A R A N C E S

2 WASHINGTON INFRASTRUCTURE PERSONNEL:

3 Jo Kracum Project Manager - Transportation
Planning - Denver, CO
4 Nick Senn Engineering Team - Denver, CO
Mark Bancale Engineering Team - Denver, CO
5 Mark DeHaven ERO Resources
6 Jean Townsend Socioeconomic Expert -
7 Coley/Forrest, Inc.

8 FEDERAL HIGHWAYS ADMINISTRATION PERSONNEL:

9 Dick Gatten Design Operations Engineer

10 GLACIER NATIONAL PARK PERSONNEL:

11 Suzann Lewis Superintendent
Fred Babb Project Manager
12 Denis Davis Assistant Superintendent

13 --o0o--

14 PUBLIC COMMENT:

15 *Clark E. Helton Private Citizen
Joan Vetter Ehrenberg Grouse Mountain Lodge/Kandahar
16 Lodge
Sally Thompson Glacier Raft Company
17 Chris McCoy Glacier Park, Incorporated
Joe Unterreiner Kalispell Chamber of Commerce
18 Jeri Maerowley FVCC/Super Host

19

20 * (As read into the record by Mary Ansotegui)

21

22

23

24

25

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2	Thursday, November 15, 2001 -	Page
3	Opening Comments by Chairman Ogle	5
4		
5	Public Comment -	
6	*Clark E. Helton	8
	Joan Vetter Ehrenberg	10
7	Sally Thompson	12
	Chris McCoy	14
8	Joe Unterreiner	16
	Jeri Maerowley	19
9		
10	--o0o--	
11		
12	Joe Kracum -	
13	Update Engineering Report & Discussion	21
	Jean Townsend -	
14	Update Socioeconomic Report	32
	David Jackson -	
15	Supplemental Socioeconomic	
16	Report & Discussion	34
17		
18	Committee Review of September 2001	
19	Final Draft Document	43
20	Subcommittee presentations & discussions re	
21	advice in addition to alternatives	
	to National Park Service	118
22	Motion by Ms. Pahl to acknowledge and thank	
23	Chairman Randy Ogle	190
24	Closing remarks by Chairman Ogle and	
25	Suzann Lewis	191

1 The final meeting of the Going-to-the-Sun Road
2 Advisory Committee was called to order at 8:00 a.m.,
3 Thursday, November 15, 2001 by Chairman Randy Ogle.
4 Chairman Ogle thanked everyone who rearranged their
5 schedules to be here, and welcomed all.

6 Chairman Ogle briefly reminds everyone of the
7 points on the agenda, and comments it should be a productive
8 day. He reiterates that all the public comments to date
9 have been considered in the draft report.

10 Chairman Ogle then hands to all Committee members
11 a copy of the latest Whitefish Chamber of Commerce
12 newsletter. Their meeting was held November 14. He directs
13 the members' attention to the bottom section of the handout
14 which reads "November 15th will be your last chance to
15 attend a public meeting on the rehabilitation of the
16 Going-to-the-Sun Road." Chairman Ogle states neither the
17 Committee nor the Park Service knows where this incorrect
18 information came from, but will contact the Whitefish
19 Chamber and correct it. He brings this to the attention of
20 the Committee members because he is disappointed in the
21 discussion of the Going-to-the-Sun-Road being closed when
22 the Committee, from its very first meeting and throughout,
23 have maintained that closure of the Going-to-the-Sun Road is
24 not an option. There was speculation as to where this
25 information is coming from; perhaps a misinterpretation from

1 Glacier Country, perhaps a misunderstanding as to what is
2 meant by getting it done as quickly as possible, thinking
3 the road must be closed to accomplish the task. Even in
4 Alberta, Canada, folks are still approaching Brian Baker
5 about the road being closed. The perception that the
6 Going-to-the-Sun Road may be closed is still with the
7 public, even though that has never been the Committee's
8 intent.

9 Chairman Ogle then moves on to the discussion of
10 he and Suzann Lewis taking a trip to Washington, D.C.,
11 October 23, 24 and 25. They talked to Karen Bridges at
12 Senator Baucus's office. They talked to Will Brooke, chief
13 of staff; Rich Molen, legislative director; and Christine
14 Heggem, all with Senator Burns's office. They talked to
15 Alan Mikkelsen, chief of staff for Congressman Rehberg.
16 They were able to talk directly with Senator Baucus on the
17 lawn of the Capitol building. Each of the delegates was
18 supportive of what the Committee is doing; each believes the
19 Going-to-the-Sun Road needs to be rehabilitated. Suzann
20 Lewis commended Randy for taking on the responsibility of
21 approaching each delegate, so that the information that was
22 disseminated to them was from the Chair of the Committee and
23 not from Suzann on behalf of the Park Service. She
24 commented that Randy represented the Committee well.
25 Questions were asked by those approached as to the cost and

1 time frame of the project. They were told a range of
2 between 120- and 150 million dollars, with a time frame
3 unknown because of the EIS process and such. Both Randy and
4 Suzann walked away with a sense of support from all they
5 spoke to.

6 Suzann also discussed the fact the Roscoe Black
7 hosted Congressman Hal Rogers from Kentucky. He is on the
8 House Committee on Appropriations, the Transportation
9 Subcommittee and related agencies. It was good for
10 Representative Rogers to see the road firsthand. It's much
11 easier for him to make decisions once he has seen the road.
12 Senator Shelby will probably be making a trip in the summer
13 of 2002. He's on the subCommittee on Transportation
14 Appropriations. He's one of the key people who needs to see
15 the road firsthand to obtain knowledge of the importance of
16 the reconstruction of Going-to-the-Sun Road.

17 Chairman Ogle said Senator Rogers fell in love
18 with this area, and he will probably be making additional
19 trips to this area for recreational purposes. He will be
20 much more helpful since he has seen the road firsthand.

21 Barney O'Quinn asked if Randy and Suzann see the
22 money coming from a special appropriations or from the
23 transportation budget? Chairman Ogle said there has been
24 discussion that the money would come from the transportation
25 budget through the Federal Highways Program. Then Suzann

1 made the comment that the needs for the Going-to-the-Sun
2 Road are so great that they exceed the total budget that the
3 Park Service has appropriated for all highway work, for all
4 road work. So it is not likely that it will come out of an
5 interior appropriations. She said that areas like the
6 Blueridge Parkway, the Rock Creek Parkway, Yellowstone, and
7 Yosemite always have considerable needs for money for road
8 work, in addition to Glacier. Suzann feels the delegation
9 is looking for a different source of funds. Barney offered
10 there's one other way that delegations have dealt with large
11 money needs, and that would be through what is called a
12 demonstration project. And with appropriating the money for
13 a demonstration project, they are ensured that the money
14 goes towards that project.

15 Roscoe is thanked for his hospitality towards
16 Senator Rogers, and Don White is thanked and recognized for
17 taking Representative Rogers on a fishing trip.

18 Chairman Ogle then turns the meeting over to
19 facilitator Virginia Tribe. Ms. Tribe thanks Mary Ansotegui
20 for taking the opening minutes of the meeting and requests
21 she present the public comments which have been asked to be
22 read before the Committee.

23 MS. ANSOTEGUI: These are comments to the
24 Advisory Committee from Clark Helton.

25 "Dear Advisory Committee,

1 "Thank you for your time and effort in working
2 toward a consensus on repairing the Going-to-the-Sun Road.
3 The task you undertook was a tough one.

4 "My name is Clark E. Helton. I've lived in and
5 around Glacier National Park for the past fifty years. I've
6 lived in this area through the '64 flood, the 1967 fires and
7 the smoke of 2000 and watched what effect the weather has on
8 visitation to Glacier. I've worked as a farmer much of my
9 lifetime and had my well-laid plans and financial future
10 altered by drought, insects and the fluctuating price of
11 crops and milk. I tell you this because I believe some of
12 you are looking for guarantees in life, and I believe you
13 are in for some disappointment.

14 "At times, I've traveled the Going-to-the-Sun Road
15 daily and been absolutely frustrated by constant delays due
16 to road construction. As a taxpayer and part owner of this
17 Park, I think you are wrong if you plan to keep road
18 construction a part of Glacier's lifestyle for the next 15
19 to 50 years. It is my considered opinion that people will
20 come to this park as long as they can drive to the top of
21 Logan Pass. Closing down one-half of the road from the Loop
22 to the Pass for two years, then from Jackson Glacier
23 Overlook to the Pass for two years is the best solution for
24 the taxpaying public. I question where you get your data
25 supporting the effect of closing sections of the road on the

1 local economy. To my knowledge, the Sun Road has never had
2 sections closed while access to Logan Pass remained open
3 from one direction.

4 "The draw to the American public is the view from
5 Logan Pass and the trail access afforded that vehicle
6 access. I wholeheartedly believe that the negative effect
7 of such a four-year closure will be minimal to the local
8 economy, while the positive savings of my hard-earned tax
9 dollars will amount to millions. I ask that you evaluate
10 your action recommendation in a broader sense than just the
11 four-year effect on local businesses. You owe it to the
12 nation to make a well-grounded decision in the best interest
13 of everyone hoping to visit Glacier during the first half of
14 this century. A recommendation and acceptance of long-term
15 construction delays is not in the best interest of the
16 majority.

17 "Thank you again for your efforts to date. I also
18 appreciate your giving me this opportunity to comment.

19 "Sincerely, Clark E. Helton, Whitefish, Montana."

20 MS. TRIBE: Thank you, Mary.

21 Could we have the next member of the public,
22 please?

23 MS. VETTER EHRENBURG: Hi. My name's Joan
24 Vetter Ehrenberg. I work here at Grouse Mountain Lodge, and
25 we also represent Kandahar Lodge. And we're called one of

1 Montana's finest resorts. And I'd like to thank some of
2 Montana's finest people for putting all of your efforts and
3 energy into this very, very important project and coming
4 here today.

5 I wanted to just express how important tourism is
6 to Going-to-the-Sun highway and it remaining open on an
7 annual basis. Closing the road for two or four years is not
8 acceptable to tourism, on either side or either community,
9 because there will -- it will be impossible to predict how
10 long that closure will happen. Tourism habits will change,
11 people will not understand how to see the Park.

12 I think the way that we need to address this
13 problem is to be very creative in alternative forms of
14 transportation. What other ways can we get into
15 Going-to-the-Sun highway and Glacier National Park aside
16 from the road? Can we explore better uses of the train?
17 Can we get, you know, five shuttles a day from Whitefish to
18 East Glacier on the train? We have a resource there. It
19 may take us five or ten years to utilize that resource, but
20 we need to begin the process to start now to get more people
21 into that part of this country with alternative means of
22 transportation.

23 Is there a way that somewhere maybe on the inside
24 North Fork Road there could be bike path built and more
25 people could see the Park in that format? Is there a

1 way -- back in the '20s when the Park was first discovered,
2 there were a thousand head of horses. Could we have a
3 hundred head of horses on the west side during construction
4 to get more people up and out and seeing the Park?

5 So I ask you just to consider brainstorming
6 alternative means of seeing Glacier National Park during
7 construction and, as well, keeping the road open, because it
8 is essential for tourism, not only to Whitefish, not only to
9 Grouse Mountain Lodge, not only to West Glacier, to the
10 whole State of Montana. Because it's the number one reason
11 people come here is to see those beautiful mountains. Thank
12 you.

13 MS. TRIBE: Thank you.

14 Do we have another member of the public?

15 MS. THOMPSON: Good morning. I know most all
16 of you. And it's good to see you that summer's over and
17 things are calming. My name is Sally Thompson, and I live
18 in West Glacier and have for about thirty years when I came
19 out for a little summer job. Now I am one of the co-owners
20 of Glacier Raft Company.

21 And I guess I came here originally this morning
22 just to listen, sort of get caught up on what's going on,
23 and I felt I would be remiss without saying something about
24 my concern to the area. I could reiterate a few things like
25 that Joan mentioned, but the importance of figuring out and

1 working with the alternatives. I know, our letter that we
2 sent earlier has been read to the record from Glacier Raft
3 Company. But the importance of keeping the road open and
4 working -- I know the challenge is gigantic. And I think
5 it's going to be more than we all even imagined when we get
6 going on it. But I see this fragile project being a really
7 important thing that we deal with with our fragile tourism
8 industry and the businesses of the State of Montana and of
9 this community.

10 So I just would like to say that I do hope that
11 when you come up with a recommendation and I know -- I'm
12 informed on the business of EIS and all that sort of thing,
13 that the importance of maintaining the road at least on
14 either one side or the other and keeping it open is what, I
15 think, is the most important thing. And along with that
16 challenge, and I think it starts right now and I think we
17 saw a little bit of it this morning with a little blurb that
18 came from the Whitefish Chamber newsletter, that none of us
19 are really certain where that came from, but right now
20 that's the perception. And so the perception is going to be
21 the hardest thing to deal with as we carry on with this
22 needed work. And I think with that comes promotion.

23 And so instead of setting aside -- you know, that
24 this is all going to be construction and this is going to
25 be -- and we're going to use that C word that no one likes

1 to hear, we need to start with our promotion now. And I
2 know from my years when I worked for the Park Service, that
3 everyone thinks that the Going-to-the-Sun Road is closed and
4 that the Park is closed. And so it's been a continuous
5 perception. It's not a problem with promotion, it's not a
6 new thing. It's been happening in the thirty years that
7 I've been here.

8 So creative promotion, and I know it is not in the
9 Park's mission to promote, but I think they need to get with
10 all of us and work at that promotion and trying to be
11 creative and get the word out that Glacier National Park is
12 still accessible and will be for many, many years to come.
13 Thanks.

14 MS. TRIBE: Thanks, Sally.

15 Are there any other comments from members of the
16 public?

17 FROM THE FLOOR: Thank you. Good morning
18 everybody. I haven't had the fortunate pleasure to meet
19 hardly anybody here, just a few. My names Chris McCoy, and
20 I'm the director with Glacier Park, Incorporated. And
21 January Ek, the president, asked me to submit a letter to
22 you people today.

23 It is to Dear Ms. Hudson, Dayna Hudson, I'm
24 assuming.

25 "The scope of the rehabilitation of the

1 Going-to-the-Sun Road is enormous. Careful consideration is
2 required to insure the desired outcome for all facets, i.e.,
3 visitor management, transportation and the socioeconomic
4 strategies and historical, cultural, environmental and
5 natural resource preservation" -- did you get that? I had a
6 longer letter, but I saw her dictating, so I thought I'd
7 shorten it -- "not to mention the financial limitations and
8 factors.

9 "Due to the tremendous visitor, social and
10 economic impacts, a full closure of the Going-to-the-Sun
11 Road is not a viable alternative for the rehabilitation. On
12 the other hand, in view of the financial considerations and
13 duration, repair as needed is not a feasible option either.
14 Because traffic management is the most critical facet, as it
15 directly affects the cost, duration, visitors and economics,
16 Alternative 3 - Comprehensive Shared Use provides the best
17 opportunity to meet these needs on all levels.

18 "The Comprehensive Shared Use alternative balances
19 the needs of rehabilitation with visitor use. The traffic
20 management plan requires that rehabilitation be scheduled to
21 minimize the overall visitor impact while balancing the
22 needs of the contractor. This strategy also provides for a
23 fairly efficient rehabilitation.

24 "As a matter of record, please let it show that
25 Glacier Park, Incorporated supports Alternative 3, the

1 Comprehensive Shared Use alternative, for the rehabilitation
2 of the Going-to-the-Sun Road in Glacier National Park.

3 Sincerely, Jan Ek, president/general manager of
4 Glacier Park, Incorporated."

5 Thank you, and have a good morning.

6 MS. TRIBE: Thank you.

7 Any other members of the public who'd like to
8 comment?

9 MR. UNTERREINER: Good morning. My name is
10 Joe Unterreiner. I'm president of the Kalispell Chamber of
11 Commerce. We've got about 700 both business organizations
12 and organizations that are members of the Kalispell Chamber
13 here in Flathead County.

14 I guess I would like -- I also just kind of came
15 to listen, but I thought I'd -- since I was here, I might as
16 well share my views. And like Sally, I guess I know most of
17 you and have been involved in this process since the very
18 beginnings of it and would like to thank you for your effort
19 and for this hard work and very kind of difficult task.

20 I guess I would like to share my view with you
21 that before you adjourn today, I think I'd like to
22 see -- encourage you to take a look at supporting making a
23 statement in favor of the Alternative number 3, the
24 Comprehensive Shared Use alternative.

25 I think it offers the best balance of accelerating

1 and getting the job done and balancing the visitor use. We,
2 I guess, in looking at your data where you surveyed and
3 determined where there was some opinion about how quickly to
4 get this project done, those results, I guess, were not
5 surprising to us because it was the same kind of information
6 that we saw early on in this process where there's a strong
7 desire out there in the community to see this work done as
8 quickly as possible. I don't think the alternative that
9 calls for a more accelerated use with some road closure is
10 really an acceptable alternative. And I think that
11 Alternative number 3 can be sold to the public and does
12 provide the best balance.

13 I would like to also encourage you to give some
14 thought, before you adjourn today, to the mitigation. When
15 I talk about mitigation, I'm not referring to just simply
16 kind of, you know, a business handout, but, really, kind of
17 a broader public relations effort. I know there's been some
18 discussion of that as you've been going through, although I
19 think probably most of your focus has been on these
20 construction alternatives.

21 So I'd like for you to give some thought today
22 about how you're going to proceed with this broad kind of
23 public relations effort. You can call it mitigation, but I
24 think it's really more how are you going to communicate this
25 decision, knowing that there is a broad interest out there,

1 much like the letter that you received I don't
2 think -- earlier that was read by the gentlemen from
3 Whitefish. There's a lot of that sentiment out there about
4 accelerating, getting this job done and getting it done
5 right and getting it done quickly.

6 So I guess I would like to encourage you to
7 see -- spend some time on this mitigation, or at least
8 decide on a process for how you might think about funding
9 that, and what kind of process you might like to see and how
10 to move that forward.

11 Early on at the beginning, before this Committee
12 was formed or at the beginning discussions of how this
13 Committee was formed, we did some research at the chamber
14 there about other national projects that are involved in
15 tourism areas. We looked at the work that was done on a
16 subway system and implemented down in the L.A. area and how
17 that impacted Hollywood. You might think that that's very
18 unrelated to the work that's going on here, but, actually,
19 the scale may be different but the issues are all very
20 closely related.

21 And in that project there was -- once again, the
22 scale's different, but there was 16 million dollars spent on
23 a very broad public relations effort that worked with
24 businesses on, you know, communications and when there was
25 something that, you know, adversely affected a business just

1 in the general kinds of construction, it allowed for them
2 to, you know, perhaps do some advertising and posters and
3 getting the word out that, you know, This business is
4 behind, you know, this fence or is behind that kind of
5 temporary construction site.

6 So I would like -- I know this is your last
7 meeting, but I would like to see this Committee give some
8 direction to the consultants or to park staff about that and
9 including this brought kind of public relations effort as a
10 recommendation of the funding of the
11 construction -- contemplated construction for the Sun Road.

12 So those are my comments for you this morning.
13 Thank you.

14 MS. TRIBE: Thank you. Good morning.

15 MS. MAEROWLEY: Good morning. My name is
16 Jeri Maerowley, and I'm an instructor of hospitality and
17 tourism at Flathead Valley Community College in Kalispell.
18 I'm also coordinator for the state Super Host program and
19 provide customer service training statewide for Montana's
20 travel industry.

21 As a result of my work, I have an opportunity to
22 have lots of contact with the people who are -- who make up
23 the travel industry in the State of Montana. I continuously
24 encounter people who work hard, invest their own money,
25 employ lots of people. Sometimes, like in the case of

1 Sally, they grow them. I mean, they employ them from the
2 time that they're young and they continue through their
3 careers. Even if they don't continue with careers in the
4 travel industry, a lot of our state gets their initial
5 career experience within our industry, that we're the first
6 job for many people in our state.

7 I'd like to encourage any alternative that uses
8 the words "road opened." And I know we don't use the C
9 word, so I'm glad that you called it Alternative 3 instead
10 of alternative C, since we're not using the C word.

11 I know that Glacier National Park is one of the
12 anchors to the travel industry in the State of Montana. I
13 know that because when I'm doing customer service training
14 in Billings, they tell me how important Going-to-the-Sun
15 Road is to the Billings community. And the people who
16 volunteer at their convention visitor bureau assure me that
17 they know the day that the Going-to-the-Sun Road snow plows
18 have finished their work. They can feel it all the way
19 across the state.

20 I'd like to encourage, then, the Committee
21 consider Alternative 3, the Comprehensive Shared Use, and as
22 Joe and others have mentioned, to think about creative ways
23 to mitigate any inconvenience to our travelers. And I know
24 that that's a problem when we're working with visitors
25 there. They want to relax, but they're in a hurry to relax.

1 But maybe we can teach them, as they're traveling through
2 our area and on the Going-to-the-Sun Road, especially, that
3 if there's any place to be held up in traffic, can you think
4 of a more beautiful location than the Going-to-the-Sun Road?

5 Thank you.

6 MS. TRIBE: Thanks, Jeri.

7 Any other comments from the public?

8 Well, I think we're kind of right on the button at
9 the nine o'clock time. So it doesn't look like we'll need
10 the extension of the half hour. So I'm going to ask the
11 Committee if you would take your first break now. You've
12 got about 15 minutes, and we'll sort of get reorganized,
13 move this out of here, unless the consultants want to use
14 it, and then be ready to move into your presentation. So
15 we've got 15 minutes.

16 (Proceedings in recess from 9:00 a.m. to
17 9:15 a.m.)

18 Ms. Tribe thanks the consultants, Joe Kracum from
19 Washington Infrastructure, and Jean Townsend from
20 Coley/Forrest, Inc. for being at this meeting. She then
21 asks Mr. Kracum to give his update presentation.

22 Mr. Kracum thanks the Committee and the Park
23 Service for the honor, the opportunity to be able to work on
24 this exciting project. It's something that a few years ago
25 he would have never imagined being able to work on.

1 Mr. Kracum again introduces Nick Senn who is on
2 the engineering team of Washington Infrastructure. He also
3 introduces Mark DeHaven, from ERO Resources, a subconsultant
4 to Washington Infrastructure Services. Mr. DeHaven will be
5 the lead on the NEPA process and carrying the draft on the
6 Environmental Impact Statement processes.

7 At the last meeting, the Committee asked for
8 clarification on the work that had been produced on the
9 different reports. A packet of information was mailed to
10 each Committee member, and Joe is going to try to
11 consolidate that into an understandable format.

12 The basics that he is going to talk about is
13 escalation of the visitor use cost, the short-term and
14 long-term, the transportation costs, the O and M, how that
15 actually fits in, the overall or the comprehensive cost, and
16 a discussion on the concepts of a one-way loop. A cost
17 escalation sensitivity sheet was reproduced in the addendum
18 that was produced to the Committee members.

19 The discussion today revolves around the five
20 alternatives that were in the original report.

21 The alternatives that were devised by the
22 Committee members at the last meeting is the process that's
23 ongoing in carrying forward to the Environmental Impact
24 Statement process. A lot of those questions and comments
25 that the Committee had to put those together are being

1 folded into Mr. DeHaven's NEPA process, so the discussion
2 today pretty much revolves around the things that the
3 engineering committee already did.

4 In the report, all of the costs were done in
5 today's dollars, constant 2001 dollars. Also in the report,
6 the escalation was at 3 percent, which is the second column,
7 and the Committee asked the engineering team to a look at
8 the 4 percent. And those are the numbers and ranges of the
9 rehabilitation costs all the way. Certainly, the
10 sensitivity is greater with the longer the period that the
11 project runs.

12 With respect to visitor use costs, they've been
13 broken down into a few categories. Included in the
14 engineering report was the dollars that were used for the
15 rehabilitation. Included in that were some areas of visitor
16 use that the team felt needed to be included in those
17 engineering, roughly, about a million-and-a-half dollars.
18 And those were to take care of the loop at Bearing Creek and
19 Wild Goose.

20 During the rehabilitation, the team gave the
21 Committee a menu of options on all the visitor use
22 possibilities. Those that are directly related to the
23 rehabilitation of the Going-to-the-Sun Road are included in
24 the second row of the presentation; 8.7 million. Other
25 amenities that were included that were part of the

1 transportation visitor use study that are not directly
2 related to the rehabilitation of the road was an additional
3 5-and-a-half million dollars. That included a number of
4 trails, pieces of the visitor use that could be improved as
5 part of the Park enhancement.

6 That 5-and-a-half million does not include the
7 west side discovery center, the St. Mary's visitor center
8 rehabilitation or the ITS, or the intelligence
9 transportation system, that was included in the
10 transportation visitor use study under chapter 4, for a
11 total of 15.7 million altogether.

12 The transportation costs, which are from the
13 original report, just discussed in a little different venue.
14 Basically, there were two basic options presented, other
15 than what is doing now. One was to provide a 60-minute
16 headway transit. Basically every 60 minutes a bus would
17 pick someone up. And there was a 30-minute headway that was
18 presented, so every 30 minutes there would be a bus pick-up.

19 The range in these two items considers either a
20 larger bus or more of a van. So the low number is the van,
21 the high number is the actual bus.

22 So for a start-up cost, it's broken down into
23 1-and-a-half million to roughly 2-and-a-half million for a
24 60-minute headway, with an annual cost of 300- to \$600,000
25 per year. And with a 30-minute, basically a 2- to

1 3-million-dollar start-up cost, with roughly a 400- to
2 \$800,000 transportation cost.

3 How does that all add up, to give the Committee an
4 overall idea of what the bottom dollars are? Now, with the
5 rehabilitation in the first column of the presentation,
6 those numbers have been escalated to 4 percent, given the
7 comments at the last period.

8 For the visitor use, the team estimated a rough
9 number of about 10 million dollars. That's that 8.7 million
10 stated earlier, and that's been escalated at 4 percent over
11 the period of time during the rehabilitation to come up with
12 that number.

13 The transit is the numbers that were just shown of
14 all those ranges coming up with a rough average, not knowing
15 which one would actually be selected, out of a possible 32
16 different matrixes, but a rough average of those different
17 scenarios and plugged that in under the transit number. The
18 presentation shows the comprehensive shared use is higher
19 than the road segment closure alternatives. The reason for
20 that difference is because it's a shorter time period. What
21 has been done is figured out with these start-up costs, plus
22 the annual cost for that transit system during the
23 rehabilitation effort. That's where that 11-, 10- and 9
24 million dollars comes from.

25 So if the Committee looks at the total escalated

1 to 4 percent, all the numbers are escalated to 4 percent
2 during the rehabilitation, these would be the total costs.

3 These numbers do not assume that the transit would
4 be essentially free of charge. There is some fair box
5 recovery out of that, as stated in the report. The
6 assumption also includes purchasing new vehicles in addition
7 to the red buses. The red buses can only carry a maximum of
8 a little less than 400 passengers, if you filled every bus
9 that will be brought back. So that this transportation is
10 in addition to. Given the differentiations that we're
11 looking at here, the team tried to consolidate it a little
12 bit so that you can just see the overall figure. These
13 costs are transit related, whereas the red buses are more
14 considered as a touring type of amenity. That's why the
15 transit is in here.

16 One of the other questions that came up was, could
17 the team try to concisely define the operations and
18 maintenance costs from the report. So a small chart is
19 shown saying it was roughly a half a million dollars in
20 labor, roughly a 900- to 1.3-and-a-half million in equipment
21 and materials, with another 130,000 in spring snow removal,
22 for a total annual budget of 1-and-a-half to 1.9 million
23 dollars.

24 The point being made here is this is where the
25 Committee should be doing, now, this kind of effort. This

1 includes the addition of a rehabilitation crew to start
2 maintaining at a much more accelerated rate that they are in
3 order to, and as has been said on more than one occasion, to
4 slow the deterioration of the road. So the engineering
5 company is recommending that this be instituted today; that
6 this kind of operations and maintenance allotment of funds
7 being used during the rehabilitation as well as after the
8 rehabilitation to protect the capital investment of the
9 road.

10 At the last meeting, discussion was brought up on
11 the one-way loop. Briefly, some brainstorming was done
12 relating to that, and this is what the engineering team has
13 come up with, because it does expand the interpretive
14 potential of the Park. It does expand day tour
15 possibilities with the possibilities of including river
16 trips in it.

17 It moves traffic past businesses, perhaps, in a
18 more assertive way. It does require multi-agency
19 coordination; including the Park, including the DOT,
20 including the DOW and so forth. There are operations and
21 maintenance issues, just from the coordination of it all.
22 It may reduce flexibility in visitor use; how people get to
23 and from different places. You may not be able to just go
24 from East Glacier to Sun Point in both directions, if you
25 just want to catch the sunrise in the morning. It does

1 increase visitor inconvenience. To get to the same place,
2 if you have a one-way loop, you may have to travel
3 additional miles for that.

4 Another thing it does is it reduces the way you
5 can actually construct the project. It reduces the
6 flexibility of how to prosecute the actual work. It does
7 impair construction access. And at the last meeting, some
8 basic scenarios were shown. If a concrete truck can only go
9 in one direction, he has to make the full trip around. It
10 does reduce production efficiency during the work because of
11 the maintenance of that kind of a system. And it still
12 requires the same traffic control as alternating one-ways
13 with intermittent stops. So there's no savings that the
14 team can find, in terms of dollars on traffic control, which
15 is a concept that was briefly discussed last time. And when
16 the team went back they discussed that you still need to be
17 able to get people in and out of the construction site, and
18 that's what you need the flaggers for, in addition to
19 controlling the public.

20 We feel that it's about the same amount of delay
21 as the alternating one-way type of scenario, which we've
22 used in the other alternatives, and there could be a
23 possibility with emergency access. We always, in
24 construction projects, give emergency access a number-one
25 priority. Changing that two-way ability may pose a problem

1 at some point in time, just with the time to get these
2 vehicles around. And it's a long shot, but there may be
3 some emergency access issues.

4 MR. JEWETT: Could you explain to me again, I
5 can't recall why there's the same delays as alternating
6 one-way.

7 MR. KRACUM: Still need to get equipment and
8 materials into the construction sites. You still need to
9 have the ability to have the traffic stopped when you're
10 doing that. You can't pull a crane into a construction site
11 while the traveling public's moving. You've got to stop the
12 traffic. You're constantly moving materials in and out of
13 that construction site, so you still need to have the
14 traffic stopped while you're doing that.

15 MS. LEWIS: Joe, would it be analogous
16 to -- what I'm trying to think of, it's sort of like set-up,
17 you know, because there's so much constant setting up for
18 each area that you're working on. If I'm the concrete truck
19 and I'm coming on the one-way loop headed for a section of
20 road that I've been assigned to, or I'm transporting a light
21 crane, in order for me to safely be able to get over to the
22 side of the road that's closed because of the construction,
23 it's just not a matter of pulling off and parallel parking.
24 You'd have to stop traffic in order to safely get that piece
25 of equipment in, or a flatbed of materials or whatever, to

1 allow them to get set up safely in that zone and then you
2 could resume the traffic.

3 MR. KRACUM: Exactly. And for getting back
4 out into the traffic. Because generally the trucks have a
5 slower acceleration rate, and you just don't want to be
6 pulling in front of people, especially in an area like this,
7 where people are more in tune with the vistas that they're
8 seeing than what's actually maybe happening on the road. So
9 we want to make sure that that adequate traffic control is
10 there.

11 MR. JEWETT: Can I go back to visitor use?
12 Because -- throw that back up. What are the itemizations of
13 what the costs are? What are the improvements that you're
14 looking at?

15 MR. KRACUM: In your packet there are four
16 pages. There are four pages of spread sheets. And I can no
17 longer see the detail. Thank you. So we've identified what
18 the costs are for each of the improvements that are included
19 in that menu during the -- in the visitor use study.

20 MS. LEWIS: Five pages, actually.

21 MR. JEWETT: Thanks.

22 MS. PAHL: The comment that was made earlier
23 during the public comment period about having a
24 communications campaign, I'm thinking a lot of what's going
25 on in Denver with the road widening and the whole T Rex,

1 blah, blah, blah, are any of those kinds of costs included?

2 MR. KRACUM: In the transportation visitor
3 use study, chapter 4 specifically addresses that in broad
4 detail. It expands on the T Rex type of opportunities to a
5 much larger extent. There has not been put any cost to that
6 at this point.

7 MS. PAHL: So in the costs you show --

8 MR. KRACUM: It does not include that; okay?

9 MS. MOE: How did you come up with the 4
10 percent escalation cost? I mean, I know that we had a lot
11 of discussion about we thought 3 percent was low. How did
12 you --

13 MR. KRACUM: The Park historically has used 4
14 percent, and that's what we were directed to use was 4
15 percent.

16 And you've got to realize, it's more for
17 comparative purposes between the alternatives, so you can
18 see the sensitivity of time with respect to the dollars.

19 MR. O'QUINN: It would seem the one-way loop,
20 so to speak, and I had thought about that a good bit early
21 on, but it might be a situation where from a traffic
22 advisory standpoint, it could be encouraged that you can go
23 across one way and encourage people to lessen the traffic on
24 the road during construction. But the practicality of it is
25 you've got to have two-way access for construction site. If

1 you got two-way access with a contractor, you might as well
2 have two-way access for the public. But you could still use
3 that concept as an encouragement with the interpretive
4 centers and what have you, to expand inside the Park and
5 outside of the Park recreationally and enjoyment
6 opportunities and cut down on some of the traffic on the
7 road. But I don't think it's practical to run a 52-mile
8 road one way.

9 MR. KRACUM: Eloquently put, and I agree
10 wholeheartedly; thank you.

11 Any other questions? If not we'll move to Jean.
12 Thank you.

13 Jean Townsend then gives her presentation. She
14 doesn't have any slides to show. She brings up two points.

15 In the packet that the Committee received, they
16 should have received Appendix B that went with the visitor
17 survey and also a separate table that just provides a list
18 of businesses by standard industrial classification. That
19 information was used in her report. So it isn't new
20 information that was just collected. It should have been in
21 that thin report the Committee received in September related
22 to the business survey. And it was just not included in the
23 report. So that's to make the business survey more
24 complete. She apologizes for it not being in the initial
25 report.

1 The second thing that Jean was to do was to pursue
2 some issues about how the forecast of direct economic impact
3 was derived. And there is some correspondence back and
4 forth in the Committee's packets regarding that. It gets
5 down to two types of issues. One issue: Mr. Jackson raised
6 a question about the number of individual components that
7 were used to estimate direct economic impacts; like did you
8 count visitors correctly and the re-entries correctly, and
9 did you use the right number of visitors per vehicle and
10 individual components. And those issues were looked into.
11 And the Park Service helped in that because some of the
12 numbers actually are from the Park Service. And the best
13 understanding is that the individual components are okay
14 numbers.

15 The second issue was regardless of the individual
16 components, the number just seems too high to Mr. Jackson.
17 And that is probably best resolved in the context of the
18 EIS, where the consultant will be building economic models
19 for each of the three counties, for southwest Alberta and
20 for the remainder of the state. And the direct economic
21 impacts need to be and will be considered in that larger
22 context. And that's really, in Ms. Townsend's opinion,
23 where the question, Are these numbers right or too large,
24 should be addressed. And they will be addressed. The
25 consultants doing that work are an outstanding firm that

1 will be addressing those issues.

2 In a lot of processes, you do the estimates of
3 direct economic effects, and then you move right into the
4 analysis of how they fit within the context.

5 In this particular piece of work, due to funding
6 and other things, we sort of truncated the work, had to take
7 a pause for a couple of months and now the EIS is beginning.
8 So it's a good planning process that when you look at the
9 economic effects in the broader context, you make sure the
10 numbers are making sense, are logical.

11 The direct economic impact figures that you have
12 are absolutely literally from the survey work. That is, the
13 team heard what people said and used those figures. So they
14 might be too high, which is Mr. Jackson's point of view.
15 Mr. Townsend's answer to that is we don't know yet because
16 we need to look at it in the larger context. And you will
17 see one of the memos that addresses that.

18 Ms. Townsend is happy to entertain any questions
19 about either Appendix B or about the direct economic
20 impacts.

21 MR. JACKSON: Would it be appropriate to
22 discuss this right now?

23 MS. TRIBE: Sure. Do you need Jean as part
24 of it, or can she sit down?

25 MR. JACKSON: Whatever she likes. I didn't

1 want to ask her a question, I just wanted to -- I think Jean
2 appropriately summarized what went on at the last meeting.
3 And my gut feeling then was that the expenditures were high,
4 the estimated total expenditures were high and, as a result
5 of that, any percentage reduction would be high as well.
6 And my guess was that it was the fact that people who visit
7 the Park for a visit actually come and go within the Park
8 several times. And although I don't know for sure that
9 that's exactly the case.

10 And after Jean responded to my comments and I was
11 supposed to respond to hers and we had a phone call, I told
12 her that I thought it ought to be checked against other
13 sources. And my first inkling was to look at all of the
14 national income data in these categories. And I started to
15 do that, and it got kind of hard and, I thought, beyond the
16 call.

17 So about Monday I had the brainstorm that we could
18 check the bed tax revenue for these three counties and look
19 at that against what her estimates were of accommodations.
20 And if certainly her estimate of accommodation would produce
21 4 percent of that as a bed tax yield, and that number ought
22 to be less than is actually collected because if it isn't,
23 that means people aren't coming to these counties if they
24 don't go to Glacier. And, of course, this meeting
25 represents my trip to this county and not going to Glacier,

1 in fact. And there's a lot of that.

2 So what I did, and incidentally this should be
3 Appendix G. I was looking at the draft and I changed the
4 numbers but not the appendix. And I took her estimated
5 accommodations expenditures from her survey for July, August
6 and September. Those were 46.9 million, and then I knocked
7 out what -- I think I did this right -- I knocked out what
8 was spent in Alberta which was part of the impact area and
9 came down to about 45.3 million, multiplied that by 4
10 percent, and her numbers suggest we collect in that
11 three-month period of time 1.8 million in bed tax in the
12 year 2000. So I went and got the bed tax stuff Tuesday. I
13 couldn't get it Monday, it was a holiday. And I've got a
14 few other copies. I gave Jean one. And we actually
15 collected in those three months a million instead of 1.8
16 million. So, in fact, her estimate of accommodations is
17 substantially high. It should be less than a million,
18 because some people come to these counties and do not go to
19 Glacier National Park. Whether they're a truck driver
20 stopping overnight or whether they're somebody like myself
21 that comes to Lake County a lot and so on.

22 So I concluded that the estimates of
23 accommodations expenditures are high. It's not because the
24 daily amount on accommodations is high. That consists with
25 all the other studies; about a hundred bucks a day. And so

1 I could be wrong, but I kind of think it's the problem of
2 multiple reentries, and I think that we should -- I think
3 that when they do the study next summer, that should be
4 carefully examined.

5 I want to say that I happen to think we ought to
6 rehabilitate the road. I don't think that -- and I hate to
7 see us have an erroneous number that somebody that disagrees
8 with that number could use to defeat the rehabilitation of
9 the road. So I think it ought to be accurate information,
10 and I think that -- my guess still is, although I could be
11 wrong, it's on the measurement of parties that come and
12 spend money around here. And I think -- and I only looked
13 at inside the three counties. I expect it's true in the
14 other outside-of-the-impact-area expenditures. I only
15 looked at accommodations. And I expect that it's in the
16 other nonaccommodation expenditures too, but this was the
17 easy thing to look at in ground truth.

18 I also note that the bed tax gives a far different
19 spacial distribution to those three counties than what her
20 survey suggested, and I think that ought to be double
21 checked too. Because I think that if you're in Flathead
22 County and thinking you're getting more than you are, then I
23 think that's wrong. And it looks like Glacier County
24 produces more bed tax revenue than the survey showed, in
25 fact. So I think that ought to be double checked as well.

1 That's all I have to say. And I hope that I'm not being too
2 hard driving or heavy-handed, but I think that's why I'm
3 supposed to be on the Committee.

4 MS. TRIBE: Comments; Tony.

5 MR. JEWETT: David, let's just, for the sake
6 of carrying this thing out then, say that your analysis is
7 accurate. Where does that play out within the socioeconomic
8 analysis that we've done, in terms of affecting all the
9 numbers?

10 MR. JACKSON: I think that it just simply
11 means there's a lower direct impact on the tourism industry
12 than the first whack suggests. Although it's still major,
13 and certainly this tourism sector in Glacier Country is the
14 most important one in the state. I don't mean to minimize
15 it. It's just seems to me that the estimates are larger
16 than reality.

17 It probably doesn't affect, as we talked about
18 last time, the ranking of the different alternatives, in
19 terms of the impacts at all. It's just that percentage
20 reduction is probably right but the amount is wrong. That,
21 I think, is the right way of saying it.

22 MR. BLACK: David, I have a question. When
23 you got the figures for the bed tax, I know that frequently
24 because I have to look at these to figure out things and the
25 state always says Well, this is what we've collected to

1 date. Everybody doesn't pay immediately when they're
2 supposed to. Did you take that into effect? And did you
3 also take into effect that starting on 9/11, tourism and the
4 hotels dropped -- the bottom dropped out? So when you do a
5 comparison between what Jean had projected and what actually
6 happened, was that taken into consideration?

7 MR. JACKSON: I'll give you a copy. I
8 brought a few along of the spread sheet that I got by
9 county. The first one is Glacier County, the second one is
10 Lake County, the third one is Flathead County. The spread
11 sheet starts in 1987 through 2000. So there's no 2001
12 collection, so there's none of the 9/11 impact.

13 I chose the year 2000 because that was the
14 baseline year in her study. I thought about averaging them.
15 If I'd averaged them, the revenues -- there was a larger
16 increase in that three-year time in Lake County than there
17 was a decrease in Flathead or Glacier Counties. So I
18 thought Well, that's splitting fine hairs. These do not
19 include delinquencies. And I don't know how big those are.
20 I don't expect that they're huge. I expect that people pay
21 their taxes pretty much on time and so on, but I think
22 people get in trouble sometimes.

23 And I'm confined to using quarters. So the
24 quarter I chose, which is the heartland of the tourism
25 business, is the June, July, August quarter. And, of

1 course, her study starts in May and ends in October. And
2 her estimates suggest that I left an important part off by
3 leaving off June, but not so much an important part by
4 leaving off October. And these things are lagged. In other
5 words, if you collect bed tax in September and send them the
6 check in October, I think I've erred on the conservative
7 time. But I've worried a little bit about that. I don't
8 know the rate of delinquencies. I just got this Tuesday,
9 and I couldn't find that out.

10 But I think that when you're looking at 800,000
11 out of 1.8 million estimate, it's a pretty big number. And
12 it ought to be less, in fact, rather than 45 percent more.
13 And so I think that's essentially the way I have to respond
14 to your question.

15 MR. BLACK: Because I thought you were using
16 this year's figures.

17 MR. JACKSON: No, just up to 2000. And
18 you're welcome to have that incidentally. I brought a
19 couple along, but I didn't feel like passing all this stuff
20 out.

21 MS. ANDERSON: One thing that's not recorded
22 in Lake County that would affect that number a little bit,
23 the KwaTaqNuk Resort does not collect bed tax, and so there
24 is a significant number of visitors that stay there in that
25 July, August, September time frame that we don't know what

1 it would be. But in the past, that would add several more
2 thousand dollars to that.

3 MR. JACKSON: I wondered that. And it
4 occurred to me that that might be the case, because of the
5 tax exempt status of tribal enterprises and all that. And I
6 think to become more real, it would be important to add it
7 in there. But -- and that may be one of the reasons that
8 there's a skewedness in the spacial distribution.

9 However, if you look at this, the numbers I have
10 here, Flathead County is 65 percent of the total. And it's
11 bigger than Glacier County. And Glacier County's not quite
12 half of Flathead County. And then if you -- KwaTaqNuk's a
13 big important resort. It's also the kind of place,
14 incidentally, that a lot of meetings are held at that I
15 don't think are related at all to visits to the Park. I've
16 been to several professional meetings there that is not Park
17 business. So I think that that is another side of that too.

18 MS. ANDERSON: The only other comment I would
19 have is that in Glacier County, those three months are
20 really the only time we ever see that kind of collection.

21 MR. JACKSON: If you want to take a look at
22 that, I'd be happy to give it to you.

23 But I've also looked at those in the earlier
24 quarter and the later quarter. And business falls in those
25 quarters in the other counties too. And you're welcome to

1 have this, if you'd like, Linda. I just brought a couple of
2 copies. We can make copies if everybody wants.

3 MS. BURCH: I'm trying to get the big picture
4 of this, since the technical part of it is overwhelming. If
5 I'm harking back to the socioeconomic report correctly, even
6 after we apply a 40 to 45-percent reduction to the cost of
7 the local economy, we're still talking the socioeconomic
8 expenses are considerably greater than the construction
9 costs and construction cost savings between the different
10 plans. Am I -- is that right?

11 MR. JACKSON: I have to go back and look at
12 that, because I don't know what the appropriate reduction
13 is. But it's very true that some of the alternatives really
14 reduce the impacts.

15 And, incidentally, the no-action impact had no
16 cost. And in the EIS, they're going to have to deal with
17 what's the cost of no action? And that could be a greater
18 likelihood of catastrophic failure, which would really make
19 that one the biggest cost item, because that would have a
20 largest impact on the tourism industry. I think
21 that's -- the study would go that far. But I think that's
22 got to be addressed in the final EIS. So yeah, there's big
23 impacts. And I don't think we have to overstate them.

24 MS. TRIBE: So David, you're not suggesting
25 that we should have full agreement here or say Well, Jean,

1 will you buy into this or will you buy into -- all you're
2 saying is that when the analysis is done in the
3 Environmental Impact Statement, that it needs to be very
4 careful in how it calculates --

5 MR. JACKSON: Correct.

6 MS. TRIBE: -- the economic costs, in
7 particular, those three counties.

8 MR. JACKSON: Absolutely correct.

9 Jean, thanks very much.

10 MS. LEWIS: Can I ask a clarifying
11 questioning?

12 At the beginning of your comments, David, you
13 suggested that this summary sheet that you provided be
14 inserted as an appendix? Did I hear you said appendix G?

15 MR. JACKSON: I'm sorry. I took the lodging
16 expenditures from the socioeconomic report, and I
17 erroneously called it H and it should have been G.

18 MS. LEWIS: Okay. All right, thanks.

19 Jean, thank you; Joe, thank you; David, thank you.

20 --o0o--

21 Ms. Tribe then moves the Committee on to review of
22 the final draft document that was produced by the Park
23 Service after the last September meeting. She explains how
24 they took a sow's ear that had some adjustments to it and
25 turned it into a silk purse in format, in that they provided

1 some background information, they added some explanation,
2 they boxed up the alternatives and improved the document
3 over the rough notes that were agreed to in September. That
4 background information and explanations are in italics in
5 the document. So everyone will be very clear about what the
6 Park Service did and what was Committee work.

7 Two things need to be accomplished. Number one,
8 the document needs to be gone through to make sure that the
9 Committee is okay with what the Park Service inserted, where
10 those italicized comments are; that they didn't misinterpret
11 in some way what the Committee had intended when they came
12 to agreement at the September meeting. That includes the
13 comments related to the alternatives as well as the comments
14 on the proposed actions and what the Committee is calling
15 the mitigation factors, the visitor use strategies.

16 Second, the Committee needs to deal with this
17 issue of whether it's going to make a recommendation, sort
18 of a consensus recommendation, to the Park Service. And the
19 interesting thing is that a poll was taken, and there wasn't
20 consensus. But if you use majority rule, then the Committee
21 agreed, as part of its ground rules, that it would offer
22 some sense of recommendation to the Park Service. And
23 Ms. Tribe asks Suzann Lewis if she would address that issue
24 for a minute to hear where the agency is, in light of the
25 poll.

1 MS. LEWIS: Thank you, Virginia.

2 I think it's important to maybe go back a little
3 bit in our memories to East Glacier and our last day of long
4 deliberations there, so that I can reiterate that no matter
5 what you choose to do as a Committee, whether you choose to
6 reach consensus and designate a specific preference for an
7 alternative or you decide to go through a process where you
8 might rank the alternatives in order of preference by the
9 Committee, or whatever you may come to today as your
10 conclusion, it will be fine to the National Park Service.
11 And it will not -- it will not negatively impact in any way
12 how we go forward with the Environmental Impact Statement.

13 So I thought it was important for you to know what
14 you decide to do will not negatively impact how we go
15 forward with an Environmental Impact Statement, because
16 that's sort of a process in and of itself, based in law.
17 And so we are completely open to whatever you would like to
18 deliver to the National Park Service, whatever format you'd
19 like to put it in, whatever words you'd like to put it in.
20 So I just want to make sure the Committee knew, reaching
21 your decision on what your final recommendation or -tions
22 plural, really, we're completely open on it. Because
23 whatever the product is, it will be taken in through the EIS
24 process.

25 MS. TRIBE: So after some thought, you're

1 pretty comfortable that we're not going to box you in.

2 MS. LEWIS: Absolutely.

3 MS. TRIBE: So our objectives then, the rest
4 of the morning and this afternoon, are to review and make
5 sure that what's been written here is what you agreed to;
6 number two, use some kind of a process to kind of see where
7 you are. And, again, I'm using the poll to move in that
8 direction, but I know there are people in the group who are
9 not comfortable, necessarily, with coming to agreement on
10 one recommended alternative. So I just want to talk a
11 little bit about consensus.

12 Suzann said If you choose to reach consensus.
13 Well, consensus, pardon me, is not a choice; it's really
14 hard work. And if you were going to have a consensus
15 recommendation and I was the facilitator, I'd walk way back
16 three meetings, and we would have started an entirely
17 different way. Because we would build toward a consensus
18 product rather than having products and then we chose the
19 one that we all liked best. Because that rarely happens
20 without lobotomies or drugs in the water.

21 And so I'm proposing to you that we look at the
22 business of perhaps ranking the alternatives, so we have
23 some relative ranking of how people feel about those
24 alternatives. We've already said in this Committee dismiss
25 number 1, we're not too thrilled about one of the other

1 ones. And so we've heard members of the public talk about
2 specific alternatives. And so I'm suggesting that we go
3 through the review, make sure that what's written here is
4 okay with us, and then we talk about what we want to do; if
5 we would like to rank those, if people who have minority
6 feelings about certain alternatives, if they want to be able
7 to write something that goes to the Park Service as well.
8 Maybe a miracle will happen during lunch and everybody will
9 walk in here and we all love one alternative and we would be
10 able to say, although it wasn't in our Charter, Suzann, when
11 you do this work, we just wanted you to know that we like
12 this one best or we like this one or two best. And so is
13 that okay with you?

14 MR. JEWETT: This is a question. I'm just
15 curious why we're going to go through this exercise when
16 it's not a part of the purpose for which we were
17 established. It seems to me -- and I've been working under
18 the premise that we had a Charter that we were supposed to
19 work under. And the Charter basically was pretty clear that
20 we're established to advise the National Park Service of the
21 development of alternatives for rehabilitation of the
22 Going-to-the-Sun Road, et cetera, et cetera, without any
23 mention of coming up with a preferred direction.

24 MS. TRIBE: That's right. It's written right
25 here.

1 MR. JEWETT: It's an interesting exercise.
2 It would be interested if we could do it, but I'm just
3 wondering why we're spending our time, frankly.

4 MS. TRIBE: Well, I'm going to sort of step
5 outside the hall and make this comment that as a
6 facilitator, the idea of using the process that has been
7 used here and then arriving at a hundred percent agreement
8 is probably not very realistic. And that's why I thought
9 about perhaps a ranking where people just gave some relative
10 prioritization to Suzann, to the National Park Service, that
11 that might be a way to go.

12 The reason that we chose to even introduce this
13 exercise is because a poll was taken of the members, and the
14 majority of the members said they would like to offer the
15 Park Service some sense of recommendation, in addition to
16 what the Charter said.

17 CHAIRMAN OGLE: And if I could just speak to
18 that, since I initiated the poll after the last meeting and
19 I distributed around with this poll, this editorial, that
20 was written in the Daily Inter Lake in Kalispell. And I
21 received unanimous feedback from members of the public that
22 came to me. And I was getting calls out of the clear blue
23 from people I didn't know, friends of mine I'd run into on
24 the street. And their feedback was -- and it actually
25 started before this editorial happened. It was What's the

1 deal with this Going-to-the-Sun Road Advisory Committee?
2 Why didn't you people finish your work? You dropped the
3 ball. Your job was to make -- to express a preference on
4 what you felt was the best alternative to the Park Service.
5 And then the editorial came out, and so I thought Well,
6 that's the feedback I'm getting, that's consistent with the
7 editorial threats. Let's see what the Committee thinks
8 about this. So that's why the poll was done, and you have
9 the results of the poll. And the consensus notion is not a
10 hundred percent, as Virginia suggested, but based upon our
11 operating rules two-thirds from this Committee. And so I
12 guess, based upon that poll, and also the feedback I
13 received, it seems to me that we would be better off giving
14 our best recommendation as to preferences, consensus or
15 ranking to the Park Service.

16 I also think it gives them much better information
17 to work with as this process goes forward. We received some
18 feedback, particularly from will Brooke and Senator Burns's
19 office, that they were disconcerted that the Committee did
20 not express a preference. And some of the comments I
21 received were Gosh, was this a wasted million bucks that we
22 spent on this effort? So I think it would help quell those
23 types of sentiments that are out there, and it would give
24 the Park Service better information to work with going
25 forward, if the group can reach a consensus. Maybe it can,

1 maybe it can't. If it can't reach consensus, ranking them
2 would give them some idea of what the Committee's thoughts
3 were. That's a little background, in terms of what went
4 into the poll in the first place and some of the feedback I
5 received.

6 MS. TRIBE: Does that answer your question,
7 Tony?

8 MR. JEWETT: It gives me the history of it, I
9 guess -- and I appreciate it. And I don't mind going
10 through the exercise. It just seems outside of the Charter.
11 And I knew it was in response to some of the public -- the
12 press reports that came out too.

13 And, you know, the whole notion of responding to
14 editorials and press reports and responding to blocks of
15 public opinion is not necessarily one we've been
16 consistently honoring so far. And so there is a little
17 inconsistency here in the approach, and I just think we
18 ought to realize that and as we go through this discussion.

19 MR. O'QUINN: I've struggled with this from
20 the concept of the NEPA document and the alternative
21 analysis that goes into a route location report and how you
22 select alternatives from that standpoint. And this project
23 is not a little different, it's a lot different from those
24 highway studies.

25 First of all, the alternatives that we're talking

1 about are not alternative routes. It's alternative
2 scenarios of how to do something. And it depends somewhat
3 on the amount of funding that's available as to how you
4 approach it. And that was one of my comments early on about
5 the alternatives were more a basis of how you'll spend the
6 money, depending on how much money you have.

7 Given that, I think we probably are in a position
8 that we can give a sense from what we are, a citizens'
9 advisory committee, of what we feel like at this point in
10 time is an acceptable or less acceptable way of going about
11 building a road -- not building a road, improving a road or
12 rehabilitating a road. What's the right word?

13 MS. PAHL: Rehabilitation.

14 MR. O'QUINN: Given the fact that something
15 has to be done. And what we really are talking about is a
16 heavy-duty maintenance project. It's not a construction
17 project, it's maintenance. We're trying to get back to what
18 we had.

19 That being the case, the alternatives that we have
20 talked about and looked about, even though we've mentioned
21 it some, are really not alternatives with respect to the
22 long-range plan of the Park. That's already been done to
23 some degree. In other words, we're not really evaluating
24 whether or not you're going to use a transit system, the red
25 bus system, BART, vehicle, private vehicles from the Park at

1 some point in time or depending entirely on private vehicles
2 or whatever. That's a different question. Because any of
3 those scenarios require that the road be rehabilitated and
4 maintained. So from that standpoint -- I mean, it really
5 doesn't -- I don't say it doesn't matter because it does
6 matter with respect to the amount of traffic that's on the
7 road, whether you have a transit system operating or not
8 operating.

9 Now, there are some questions that come up as a
10 result with regard to parking, pullouts and these types of
11 things which have really gotten beyond the detail of what
12 we've done. And I thought we were going to go more into
13 that detail than we have. But given that we have not and
14 what we're talking about is construction sequence and
15 scenarios, I feel more comfortable in saying if you're going
16 to do a heavy maintenance project, this is the best way to
17 go about it, based on what we know now. Given the fact that
18 things can come out of the environmental document that would
19 have a change on that. And I still feel like that we should
20 give an interim report or an interim suggestion or
21 recommendation to the Park Service with the notion that the
22 Committee would revisit it upon completion of the EIS.

23 MS. TRIBE: So, Barney, in some ways, after
24 some thought, you've kind of come around the corner a little
25 bit.

1 MR. O'QUINN: Little bit.

2 MR. TRIBE: I remember last meeting you
3 weren't very comfortable with the recommendation.

4 MR. O'QUINN: Yeah. And I still think they
5 may have done enough work to say the one-way pair or the
6 one-way loop is not a feasible alternative, it can be
7 dismissed. I think it's going to have to be addressed in
8 there and say this was an alternative that we considered and
9 dismissed for cause and say what the cause was. The notion
10 of the transit may be -- it may be addressed as saying that
11 this is something to be evaluated in the future as Park
12 visitation increases, again, beyond the scope of the heavy
13 maintenance that we need to do on the road. Irrespective of
14 whether you use red buses or blue buses or whatever buses,
15 if you're not going to do something, the road's going to
16 fall down. So we're talking a maintenance project. And
17 from that standpoint, I think we've pretty well beat the
18 alternatives to death.

19 MS. TRIBE: Okay. And, again, this kind of
20 preference that goes forward, if that's what we do, in no
21 way ties the National Park Service to selection of a
22 preferred alternative or the statement of that preferred,
23 other than in the public comments that come forward.

24 MR. O'QUINN: And I think that our
25 contribution to that should be appropriately based on the

1 results of the studies at this point in time; this is what
2 it appears. And that's always subject to change.

3 MR. DAKIN: Well, Suzanne's comment was kind
4 of very important to me, because I was always afraid that if
5 we evolved to a recommendation here, which would go beyond
6 our charge under the Charter, and if we stated Here's a
7 range of alternatives, I think we have an obligation and we
8 are fulfilling it to be intellectually honest to say that
9 this broad range should be investigated, my fear was that if
10 we said But this is the one we really think you ought to do
11 that we would, going back even to what regional director
12 Wade told us when we started this project, invite
13 litigation. I mean, that you could go through the NEPA
14 process and if you ended up with a conclusion that was not
15 congruent with our advice, you could be sued because you
16 didn't follow the advice of your Advisory Committee. If you
17 went through the NEPA process and ended up with the
18 conclusion that was congruent with our recommendation, you
19 could be sued because it was a done deal from the very
20 beginning.

21 So I think what you said, Suzann, is that that
22 isn't a danger. That regardless of this Committee's
23 expression of a preference, the NEPA process can be entirely
24 open, as it has to be, and that the conclusions that the
25 NEPA process lead to won't be a handcuff to you in terms of

1 litigation. Is that right?

2 MS. LEWIS: Well, I think it's -- I think we
3 all know from our own experiences that I would never predict
4 whether I'm going to get sued or not get sued or what the
5 suit's going to look like.

6 But I do think to say that your recommendation, I
7 don't believe, will weigh heavily on whether or not we're
8 sued or not sued. I would say that through the NEPA process
9 there is litigation. It may come well from lots of other
10 different aspects of it. So that's why I feel -- one of the
11 things I wanted to make a comment on, based on what Barney
12 said as well, is that one of the overwhelming important
13 aspects of your work over the last two years is the ground
14 work that it does lay for us to go into an EIS.

15 I'm very honored to be a part of an EIS that has
16 so much more substantial study going into it, on the aspect
17 of a heavy maintenance or road rehabilitation plan. We're
18 normally not in -- don't have the luxury to study, up front,
19 before we even get to the Environmental Impact Statement. I
20 mean, if someone asks me the value of the million dollars
21 that's been spent in the last two years, I would hopefully
22 respond that that million dollars has provided us with a
23 wealth of knowledge in this community and the Park Service
24 where we're going to have a very good EIS process. Because
25 if we didn't -- imagine if we started the EIS without this.

1 You know, you're talking years to get it done.
2 Because -- and the funding part of it may have been much
3 more complicated.

4 So my feeling is there is no inherent risk that
5 you would be giving the National Park Service or the EIS
6 process by whatever final conclusions you reached today. I
7 think that your work is so valuable to the process, in terms
8 of background and validity, that the whole thing began with
9 the public process. And now we're going to take it to
10 another stage in the public process.

11 MS. TRIBE: And, Suzann, I'm assuming that
12 it's also important to you that, again, if this Committee
13 gives you a recommendation, consensus or top two or
14 whatever, that they understand that that in no way
15 influences your decision on -- through the analysis and your
16 decision. It doesn't predispose in any way your decision
17 that comes out of that EIS process.

18 MS. LEWIS: It can't, by law.

19 MS. TRIBE: Because that's the part that
20 would bring about -- and so the only part that makes it even
21 dicey is if she ends up selecting a preferred that's exactly
22 what you guys said and somebody steps in and says Wait a
23 minute, was this wired? But what you're saying is I'm
24 comfortable saying to the public this is not connected.

25 MS. LEWIS: The beauty of NEPA is that is the

1 document of the final decision. And if it were to be a
2 decision different from the Committee's recommendation or in
3 accordance with the Committee's recommendation, the document
4 must support whatever the final decision is, the record of
5 decision, which is probably the hardest part about my job,
6 is that I have to make that decision, the final decision and
7 put it forth for signature.

8 MR. BAKER: Probably it was one of the
9 unwritten goals of this Charter of this Committee was to
10 provide excellent up-front information for going into the
11 NEPA process, so I agree with you on that. Two things here.
12 One, it was good to hear you say what you said at the very
13 beginning regarding tying your hands with the process.

14 I've been thinking about this for the last month,
15 and I've had a lot of people come up to me, as has other
16 Committee members, saying, you know, What are you guys
17 doing? I thought you guys had this all figured out and we
18 were going forward, and now all of a sudden it seems as if
19 we're back to where you started. Well, we're not back to
20 where we started, but I think too many of us are getting our
21 hats hung up on where it says alternatives. There's a
22 little S at the end of that word. And I think a lot of us
23 think Well, it has to be multiple. I don't think reading
24 that Charter, and other people have read that Charter, that
25 does not necessarily mean multiple alternatives. It could

1 mean one; okay? I've talked to many people about this, and
2 it says nowhere in this Charter does that mean to us where
3 you are having to give a range of alternatives. You are to
4 provide alternatives to the Park Service; maybe one, maybe
5 ten. So I think we're on the right track of alternatives.
6 We may boil it down to one, we may not. We may rank it,
7 whatever. But we can't get hung up on that little S at the
8 end of that word.

9 Secondly is, I need to clarify exactly where the
10 final report -- how it's going to go further in the process.
11 Once we agree upon and sign off on this final report, it is
12 my understanding that as it goes into the NEPA process, we
13 just become one more element into it. It's as if we're one
14 single more element going into the process. It carries no
15 more weight than any other intra-governmental agency that
16 wishes to comment on it or whatever; is that correct?

17 MS. LEWIS: That is correct. I mean, your
18 document will stand as an administrative and legal record of
19 this group's work. The document will be accessible for all
20 times in our library. The information that's in the
21 document and the studies that were prepared will then be
22 used by the National Park Service to put forth a draft
23 Environmental Impact Statement with a draft set of
24 alternatives that may or may not look and match identical
25 the language that you find in your report. But my guess is

1 you'll be able to see in the draft alternatives those parts
2 of your report that have been incorporated in it. And then
3 it goes out to public comment.

4 MR. BAKER: So in reality, this final
5 document is no different than me as a private citizen coming
6 up with my ten-page letter saying This is my recommendation
7 to what should be done to the Going-to-the-Sun highway.

8 MS. LEWIS: Correct.

9 MR. JACKSON: I think when we started this,
10 most of us believed that no action was not a viable
11 alternative because nobody believed that we should allow a
12 national historic treasure to fall off the cliff and be
13 lost. We have not asked Washington group to really
14 carefully analyze that alternative in their analysis. We
15 know that that has to be done in the EIS, but none of us
16 have approached that. And I think in all of our
17 deliberations, nobody's changed their mind to think that we
18 should let it fall off the cliff. But we know that that's
19 got to be done in the EIS, and the EIS has to do a better
20 job of analyzing that than we have done.

21 And the other thing we've concluded, I thought,
22 for a way of phrasing it, but the alternative that would
23 rehabilitate the road to standards at a minimum government
24 cost, would have the largest economic impacts on the
25 industries that depend on the road for their livelihoods.

1 We've concluded that. So we know from that that the world
2 falls somewhere in between there, which happens to be our
3 midrange alternatives. I don't remember the numbers. I
4 mean, I think we can conclude that. But I wouldn't tell the
5 government to not do a valid EIS and not carefully examine
6 those kinds of side-board alternatives. But you've got to
7 make comparisons to reach a conclusion, and you need those
8 comparisons to reach the conclusion. And they've got to do
9 a better job in making those comparisons than we have.

10 Although I'm convinced that what I've learned here
11 from engineers is how creative traffic management can be and
12 how you can actually creatively reduce those impacts.
13 That's what I've learned from this experience. And I think
14 that's a wonderful conclusion to make and to recommend on.
15 I don't know whether I want to call it an alternative in an
16 EIS, but I think that's a simple conclusion to reach after
17 these meetings.

18 MS. TRIBE: And I think that the documented
19 agreement supports what you said, David, about the
20 Committee's view that it's the Park Service's job to develop
21 the no-action included. They don't have a choice about
22 whether they have to because NEPA regulations. The idea of
23 them not doing a thorough analysis is not possible. You
24 have to do a thorough analysis. Legally, you cannot hand
25 them money until the record of decision is signed, and

1 that's what has to happen before you go to budgeting. So
2 we're just sort of clearing the air up here a little bit.

3 Brian said, you know, whether you agree with him
4 or not, that he would be comfortable with one alternative.
5 I'm going back over here. I'm looking at the last part of
6 the Charter which says "These alternatives will be analyzed
7 in the environmental document that will provide the basis
8 for the agency's decision." So what I don't want to do is
9 throw the Charter out. And we have done the job in looking
10 at, limited as they are, a limited range of alternatives
11 that you are saying to the Park Service We would like to see
12 these analyzed in the document. Now, we agreed, also, that
13 they may have other alternatives as well.

14 What we're trying to decide or at least clear the
15 air on right now is just the business of kind of how we
16 feel, and several people have comments, about kind of how
17 we're going to move forward in looking at this business of
18 after we close the document, are there some other things we
19 want to say to the Park Service. And one of those other
20 things may be we -- of all the ones out there so far, we
21 like this one best, or we would sort of rank them this way
22 or some relative preferencing related to the alternatives.

23 And then I'm also going to give you an opportunity
24 to just be able to say some other things to the Park
25 Service, if you would like to. They don't have to be agreed

1 upon things. I don't want it to be just a brainstorm list.
2 But if there are other things that you would really like to
3 say, then those will go in as sort of an addendum, and we've
4 provided a page for that in the document as well. And that
5 will be kind of the last thing we do before we kiss and hug
6 and say the package is good.

7 So I want to go to Barney, then to Barbara.

8 MR. O'QUINN: What I was going to say before
9 we got into that last thing, not the kissing and hugging,
10 but having to do with the Committee as an entity that's
11 official and what have you, the next phase is the EIS. And
12 I don't know whether the Park Service has used this in the
13 past, but I give it to you as a suggestion; a steering
14 committee which would not carry the same weight of a
15 congressional committee, in essence, of what we are, but it
16 would serve a lot of the same functions which really is
17 getting information back to the communities and the other
18 federal agencies that will be involved in the final decision
19 as to what's going on. So at the end of the day you don't
20 have a final report and say This is what we want to do, but
21 keep the group up to speed all throughout. And I've been
22 involved on a number of those, particularly with the large
23 somewhat controversial or very controversial projects. And
24 in doing that, there are no surprises. And I would suggest
25 that you could use some or all of some of the people that

1 are on this Committee, as well as there might be others you
2 want to add, such as representatives from the National Fish
3 and Wildlife Service or some of the other federal agencies
4 who will definitely have some input in that regard. And,
5 again, there's no official function that that committee or
6 steering committee would provide, other than staying abreast
7 of what was going on all through the study and kind of being
8 an oversight group and also a contact back to the local
9 communities.

10 MS. LEWIS: Fred, maybe you can correct me if
11 I'm going in the wrong direction on this. But you know how
12 every agency does NEPA a little differently? It just
13 depends on which agency you're working with. And the Park
14 Service, I think what we use that might be comparable to
15 what you're talking about is asking, at the beginning of the
16 process, for certain -- for any organization to be a
17 cooperating agency --

18 MR. O'QUINN: That's a little different.

19 MS. LEWIS: -- in the EIS.

20 MR. O'QUINN: That's a little different in as
21 a cooperating agency is one that has an official function,
22 because they have official ties to the project.

23 What I'm speaking of is part of the public
24 outreach, the public involved problem that gets those with
25 interest. And they do not have any cause, veto authority or

1 anything like that. It's an input group.

2 MR. KRACUM: The Interstate 70 Canyon project
3 which had an environmental impact process that went well
4 over ten years and the design process was three or four
5 years and a construction process for 12 years, had just a
6 committee like that. There were five local people. And
7 they started at the beginning of that. They went right
8 through the entire project environmental process, design and
9 construction. I mean, they had basically a 20-year job to
10 work with, and it did work.

11 MR. O'QUINN: It gives the agency a lot of
12 credibility with the local government and the public as
13 well.

14 MR. BABB: I just wanted to add to what
15 Suzann has said. We have used them in the past in the Park
16 Service, and I think there was one used recently in
17 Yellowstone a few years ago. But yes, we've used them also.

18 MS. TRIBE: So without having to come to
19 agreement with specifics here, Barney, what you're saying is
20 we would like the Park Service to be creative about the kind
21 of strategies that they use for public involvement and
22 public outreach and public communication as you go forward.
23 And if there are some informal mechanisms where members of
24 this Committee could be involved, without you buying their
25 lunch or their gas, without any kind of -- I'm going to

1 remove the word "oversight" that you used and I'm going to
2 remove the word "steering" that you used and just thinking
3 of it as sort of this group that has structured conversation
4 and focuses on what's happening in sort of a two-way
5 communication, that's what you're talking about, is sort of
6 some creative public communication strategies. And maybe we
7 can add that to that list in a while.

8 MR. O'QUINN: If you put a steering
9 committee -- and I'm going to put that word back in. It's
10 more than just a creative public involvement, because it is
11 a group like Joe mentioned that stays with the project
12 throughout. And they do have some quasi-official function.
13 It's not -- it's certainly not telling you how to do your
14 job, but it's -- you're trying to get the buy-in all
15 throughout.

16 MS. TRIBE: And that is pretty creative.

17 MS. PAHL: There are a lot of people that get
18 paid to spend their time trying to understand congressional
19 intent and what is meant by their language. And in
20 disagreement with Brian, I think "alternatives" means
21 alternatives with an S. But on the other hand, if our
22 Senior Senator Burns, who helped create this Committee,
23 believes that this Committee's supposed to come forward with
24 a preferred alternative or best guess about what it might
25 be, then I think there's no reason for us not to go ahead

1 and do that.

2 And in doing it, I guess I would say, from my
3 experience in coming to these meetings and deliberating with
4 the Committee members, I feel totally confident that this
5 road can be rehabilitated; that it can be rehabilitated in a
6 way that will accommodate, as much as possible, the visitor
7 use of the road.

8 What I've been totally frustrated by is the lack
9 of our ability to communicate that to the public. I mean,
10 even though we have people from the press attending, what
11 they write and what they hear don't always seem to be the
12 same thing. So if in creating or announcing what we think
13 is the best way to approach it helps to create the
14 communication that we seem to be lacking with the public
15 based on the comments we're getting, et cetera, then I think
16 that's our reason to do it.

17 MR. BLACK: If I could get a clarification,
18 because the last meeting was my first meeting, not my third
19 meeting. And listening to Brian and then Barbara relative
20 to the Charter that we have, what seems to me is maybe
21 missing in here is it doesn't say we will provide all the
22 alternatives because we're saying that Hey, other
23 alternatives are going to go in and whatnot. So if we are
24 advising the Park Service on alternatives that will be
25 included in the EIS to be looked at, why do they have to be

1 a complete smorgasbord going from A so Z? Or can they just
2 be H and G or something like that? That's, you know, where
3 I'm kind of wondering. Because as a new Committee member, I
4 wasn't here when apparently everybody went through building
5 the Charter or however the Charter came about. And my
6 understanding was, when I read it, okay, we come up with
7 alternatives that are given to the Park Service, the Park
8 Service looks at these and puts them in with the other
9 alternatives that they necessarily have to have in the EIS,
10 and then the whole process continues.

11 MS. TRIBE: And I think that's what we agreed
12 to last time, Roscoe. That's why we sort of dismissed one.
13 Well, if the Park looks at no action, that's where we ended
14 up. And, again, I don't think this Committee wrote the
15 Charter. Last time was my first time.

16 MS. LEWIS: The Secretary of the Interior
17 wrote the Charter.

18 MS. TRIBE: It was given to the Committee
19 when the Committee was selected. So "The purpose of the
20 Committee is to advise the National Park Service in the
21 development of alternatives for reconstruction of the
22 Going-to-the-Sun highway in Glacier National Park, focusing
23 on" blah, blah, blah, blah. "These alternatives will then
24 be analyzed in an environmental document that will provide
25 the basis for the agency's decision." In no way does it say

1 they're the only alternatives. In no way does it say that
2 you have to have 59 of them. It does not say wide range
3 ranging from this to this, but it does say assisting and
4 advising in the development of, and that whatever you push
5 forward will be included in there. That was the agreement
6 last time.

7 Last time when we developed all of this business,
8 we ended up with about three alternatives that we all felt
9 could go forward. And so if we don't have any more comments
10 then, I think after Randy's comment, then I think that maybe
11 I'm going to see if we can bring us forward to starting the
12 review. And when we finish that, then we'll go back to the
13 discussion about how we want to proceed, in terms of what
14 the sort of recommended preferred or rank or whatever that
15 process looks like. So, Randy?

16 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Just a quick comment and then
17 a question for Suzann to follow up on Barney's point.

18 I do not think there is any inconsistency between
19 what our Charter says and expressing a preference or a
20 ranking. The Charter says we're supposed to advise on
21 alternatives. We've done that. There are alternatives. It
22 doesn't say you can't express a preference or a ranking, and
23 that's just a part of the advising process. So I think it's
24 entirely consistent with the Charter, and I don't think that
25 there is anything outside or beyond the Charter by

1 expressing a preference or a ranking.

2 To follow up on Barney's point about steering
3 committee or some such thing, the question for Suzann, if
4 the Park Service doesn't opt to go for a steering committee
5 or something of that nature, would there be anything to
6 prohibit this Committee, maybe as the former
7 Going-to-the-Sun Road Advisory Committee or something of
8 that nature, from expressing further advice on what -- to
9 the Park Service after the EIS process is completed?

10 MS. LEWIS: No. There would be no problem
11 with that. I mean, if any of you, through the EIS process,
12 would choose to work together as a whole group or work
13 together as small groups and send in comments on the draft
14 alternatives and you want to sign it as former members of
15 the Advisory Committee, there's nothing to stop that from
16 happening. But it would be weighed the same as a written
17 comment or an oral comment that was presented at meetings by
18 Jane Doe or John Smith.

19 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Seems to me my point, Barney,
20 is that I think the steering committee idea is a good one.
21 And seems to me, in terms of information to the Park
22 Service, this group has more information than the average
23 person on the street regarding this road at this point in
24 time. But if they didn't decide to do that, seems to me
25 when they finished up the EIS, if we wanted to do a poll or

1 something or other and say Okay, here's what we think about
2 what decision you have recommended going forward with now
3 that the EIS is completed, we could certainly do that on our
4 own as the former committee.

5 MR. O'QUINN: You're saying that it has no
6 more weight than Jane Doe or John Doe. But in the
7 decision-making process, I would have to think it really
8 does. Because if you've got a comment from the National
9 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, it carries more weight than
10 one from Hunter Bill. I mean, you're looking at the
11 credibility and the knowledge background where it's coming
12 from. And I would have to think that this Committee, with
13 the deliberation of what it's done, you don't pile it all up
14 and weigh it because it's a decision-making process, you
15 have to go through and, obviously, it would have some
16 credibility.

17 MS. LEWIS: Well, I think the difference in
18 how, you know, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service isn't
19 likely to largess a large stream of consciousness letter.
20 They are typically going to make very specific comments and
21 point out where we may have erred in analysis, based on data
22 that we have, or that they would -- any conclusions that we
23 might state in the document and the draft -- you know, it's
24 sort of different.

25 Now, the John Q. Public may well have data that

1 they'll refer to, and that doesn't happen as often as an
2 agency, but I agree with you. But usually the letter we get
3 from the public and the letter we would get from the
4 wildlife biologist from fish and wildlife services, they're
5 pretty drastically different letters. So I agree with you.
6 But it just depends on what the actual comment is.

7 MS. TRIBE: And now we are back to why
8 federal agencies are very hesitant to ever have advisory
9 committees. Because what happens is that advisory
10 committees, after all the work they did and the money that
11 was spent, figure Well for crying out loud, you think we
12 don't know more than Mary Smith who wrote you from Chicago?
13 But legally, if you went to court and she picked you over
14 Mary Smith and could prove that you had undue influence,
15 then she would be in trouble. And I think that takes us
16 back again to why the Charter was developed the way the
17 Charter was developed.

18 It was developed -- in fact, I want to go back,
19 Suzann, to what you said a few minutes ago. You said we are
20 probably in a better position than the Park Service ever is
21 when they start an Environmental Impact Statement process.
22 Because you have done so much work, in terms of the social
23 analysis about what kind of sort of scheduling of this
24 maintenance is going to fly or not fly with the public. And
25 you've talked about what the risk level is, in your minds,

1 about what the economy in northwestern Montana can afford
2 and not afford when it comes to how this highway is
3 rehabilitated. And although you might feel like Oh, my
4 gosh, I want to do a preferred, the beauty of your work is
5 in here. Because you're saying to the National Park Service
6 These are the ways that we will tolerate. These are the
7 ways we think we can make it through, economically. These
8 alternatives are reasonable to look at.

9 Now, after that's done, what that does is it's
10 enriched the environmental analysis in a way that rarely
11 happens, other than just flat old public involvement where
12 people come in, they testify, but they don't have the
13 benefit of the interaction that's occurred here and the
14 struggle and the sweat and tears that got to this point.

15 So the idea that your work is not valuable, in
16 terms of just being alternatives, this is probably far more
17 valuable in the long run, and worth the money that was
18 spent, than the final version of whether we think this one
19 is the most important or not.

20 Now -- so I don't want to dismiss this work. I'd
21 like to get through the review, if we could, and then when
22 we're finished talk about what kind of product we want to
23 give to them in terms of a total recommendation, two-thirds
24 vote, a ranking, whatever, and that that will be in addition
25 under the topic of advice. And advising in the very limited

1 way that you have permission to advise. We can't capture
2 her. And even though she's here saying I'm comfortable with
3 all this coming in, I want to hear where you are, Senator
4 Burns is saying Well, I thought they were going to, at the
5 same time, I think it's important that we honor the
6 integrity of the process as it was developed. And that we
7 don't violate that in a way that we don't give ourselves
8 credit for recognizing the importance of the development of
9 or the advice on these two or three alternatives that you're
10 pushing forward. Because in some ways, that's the best
11 social data they're going to get.

12 And what Barney's suggesting is that that
13 continues in a less formal way throughout the process.
14 Because the environmental document will have a lot to do
15 with ecosystem kinds of things and heritage kinds of things
16 and speaking of Fish and Wildlife Service, threatened and
17 endangered species kinds of things and fly over, and all the
18 kinds of things that go into an Environmental Impact
19 Statement. You guys have been here to do the social data.
20 And that's something that's always weak in Environmental
21 Impact Statement.

22 So could we start the review? Would that be okay
23 with you? You ready?

24 So what I'd like to do then is open the books.
25 I'd like to go page by page. So Mary and Dayna have figured

1 out this Cracker Jack process where we're going to try to
2 manage this in a way that we quickly review the page, we
3 make sure that we're okay with everything. If we have an
4 adjustment, we give it to them and they put it in the
5 machine right away. Should we miss it, we've got it
6 verbatim in Bambi's recording.

7 Is there any problem with the picture? David
8 Jackson was already complaining about the picture.

9 Well, I'm going to go past the table of contents,
10 if that's okay, to page 3. And one more time, anything that
11 you see in italics are the inserts or the explaining that
12 the Park Service tried to do so that this product would be
13 more readable and more useful to the Park Service as well as
14 the public.

15 Brian.

16 MR. BAKER: The very first one, since we were
17 talking about the Charter, do we have to reiterate word for
18 word exactly what the Charter says? If so, then we must
19 change the word "rehabilitation" back to "reconstruction."
20 I'm sorry; but that's why I'm asking.

21 MS. PAHL: Can I trade you an S for
22 rehabilitation?

23 (Laughter).

24 MS. LEWIS: Brian, I think it's very good
25 that you bring that up. Because I would agree that we do

1 have to use that word "reconstruction." I'd also suggest
2 that we could put in brackets "rehabilitation," since that's
3 the agreed upon language you chose to use as a group. But
4 it would not recognize the actual -- the Charter is a legal
5 document. And I really appreciate you pointing that out
6 that we missed that. So we'll go back and change --

7 MS. TRIBE: So in the Charter statement where
8 it says "rehabilitation," we're changing "rehabilitation"
9 back to the official Federal Register language for the
10 Charter, which is "reconstruction." And we can't trade out
11 of the S.

12 MR. BAKER: And further on instead of
13 "rehabilitation strategies," it has to say "reconstruction."

14 MS. TRIBE: Right. Wherever "rehabilitation"
15 is used, we go to "reconstruction." In fact, Mary and
16 Dayna, we'll use this thing.

17 MS. HUDSON: It's appendix A.

18 MS. TRIBE: Anything else on page 3?

19 Could we go to page 4? Any problem with your
20 names or who you represent? Have you added constituencies
21 as you came on?

22 Page 5. Now, I'm assuming that the letter that
23 went out to all of you from Randy, that all of you read this
24 and you've memorized the two or three places where you need
25 to do something.

1 Could we go to page 7.

2 Page 8.

3 Page 9.

4 MR. STEWART: On page 8, we've got the
5 Charter again, and we need the same changes.

6 MS. TRIBE: So page 9 again. And, Roscoe,
7 you had your hand up.

8 MR. BLACK: It's the fourth paragraph down.
9 It says "The Committee intends no endorsement of any
10 particular" -- are we going to leave that in there, in view
11 of what we're doing?

12 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think we should delete
13 that. That was my suggestion. It was in the last time
14 around, but it seems to me we should delete that.

15 MS. ANSOTEGUI: Agreed?

16 MS. TRIBE: Okay.

17 MS. BURCH: Well, there's an extra semicolon
18 in the fourth line. "The engineering concepts are based on"
19 semicolon. I don't think that one really needs to be in
20 there, the last paragraph.

21 MS. TRIBE: Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I guess another point here is
23 since this is the final report, this business -- the last
24 sentence of paragraph four probably ought to come out. "The
25 Committee will meet in November."

1 MS. TRIBE: Oh, sure. And the Park Service
2 turned this around in a matter of a few hours.

3 MS. LEWIS: The only thing I'd like to
4 comment on, and I don't disagree with what you're doing.
5 This is a document that stands of your work in September.
6 So that's why the next chapter was inserted and left blank,
7 which is your final recommendation. So you might want to
8 consider the road you're going down. If you're going to try
9 to take this chapter three and make it your final report,
10 then we'll need to hear from you. Do you want us to
11 eliminate chapter three, or do you want to leave this
12 chapter intact which showed progress up until September 2001
13 and then have the forth chapter fill in what the final is?

14 MS. TRIBE: Thank you very much. I think
15 that clarification is one we all needed.

16 What this is right here is the -- it's basically a
17 summary of what you did in September of 2001. And so maybe
18 instead of changing these sentences, we should -- maybe the
19 introductory or the top -- the name of the thing at the top
20 maybe should be a little clearer.

21 MS. PAHL: Report from the meeting of.

22 MS. TRIBE: Yeah, instead of advice, or
23 report from September such and such meeting, and then draft
24 committee advice.

25 MS. PAHL: Why don't we just say report from?

1 MS. TRIBE: Okay.

2 So this is Report from the Committee September
3 2001. And then Going-to-the-Sun Advisory Committee draft
4 work.

5 MS. ANSOTEGUI: That's the heading.

6 MS. TRIBE: With a line under it; okay?

7 MS. LEWIS: Could we say that one more time?
8 Do you have that, Mary?

9 MS. ANSOTEGUI: The report from the Committee
10 September 2001, Going-to-the-Sun Road Advisory Committee
11 draft work.

12 MS. LEWIS: Not advice.

13 MS. TRIBE: Draft report. You could say
14 report again.

15 MS. ANSOTEGUI: Draft report. That will be
16 the heading for chapter three.

17 MS. TRIBE: I'm just trying to err, Suzann,
18 between the interpretation right away -- sort of the
19 misinterpretation that this was other than the report from
20 that.

21 MS. LEWIS: For clarification purposes, does
22 that then mean in the fourth paragraph we will leave the two
23 sentences as written?

24 MS. PAHL: Yes.

25 MS. TRIBE: Might we be able to say, so that

1 it tracks a little bit later, could you say At this time,
2 the Committee intends no endorsement?

3 MR. O'QUINN: Because we said we'd revisit it
4 in November.

5 MS. TRIBE: That's right.

6 So Mary and Dayna, At this time, the Committee
7 intends no endorsement.

8 MS. TRIBE: And then we leave the final
9 sentence in about meeting in November. And we've got the
10 semicolon.

11 Could we go to page 10, please.

12 Page 11.

13 MR. DAKIN: Excuse me. There on page 10,
14 under the No-Action Alternative, I believe that it reads
15 much better if you eliminate the word "and" after the cross
16 out.

17 MS. TRIBE: "While the Environmental Impact
18 Statement process requires the National Park Service to put
19 forth a No-Action Alternative, the Committee believes."
20 Okay?

21 MS. PAHL: Can I ask for a point of
22 clarification? Does the difference between this draft and
23 the one we were mailed -- did it incorporate some of the
24 comments that Randy made?

25 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Not all of them, but most of

1 them.

2 MS. TRIBE: I think you only got comments
3 from a few people, didn't you?

4 MS. LEWIS: Anna Marie and Randy.

5 MS. TRIBE: So those are -- as much as
6 possible, those are incorporated in here.

7 MR. O'QUINN: This is, in essence, the
8 minutes of the September meeting.

9 MS. TRIBE: It's the minutes of the September
10 agreements with some clarification inserted by the National
11 Park Service.

12 MS. MOE: On page 10, again, I think we need
13 to move the "and" that we just scratched down before it
14 after the next comment. So that it would read, "While the
15 Environmental Impact Statement process requires the National
16 Park Service to put forth a No-Action Alternative, the
17 Committee believes Glacier National Park personnel are in
18 the best position to describe the No-Action Alternative, and
19 the Committee does not recommend that the No-Action
20 Alternative be adopted."

21 MS. TRIBE: Okay. Dayna, are you okay if we
22 go forward?

23 MS. HUDSON: Yes.

24 MS. TRIBE: Page 11.

25 Page 12.

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: That's the one that -- that
2 was my fourth suggestion. And Fred talked to me about it.
3 They looked through it and decided -- and maybe we need to
4 leave it this way for now. But the reason for my fourth
5 suggestion, which was we make a clear statement that the
6 Priority Rehabilitations Alternative is not recommended by
7 the Committee, was based upon the public input that said
8 that we should try to get this job done as quickly as
9 reasonably possible without total closure of the road. And
10 I certainly thought that the -- I think what is said here is
11 consistent with what we said at our last meeting.

12 But I think we should, either in our next
13 chapter -- probably in our next chapter, my recommendation
14 for the Committee's final report would be that we make a
15 clear statement that we're not recommending this alternative
16 to the Park Service as one to seriously consider, because I
17 think it's inconsistent with the public input. And I don't
18 think that we should leave any confusion out there for the
19 media or the public to pick up that we were recommending a
20 20- to a 50-year alternative fix for this road. And so
21 maybe it goes in the next chapter, but that was the reason
22 for my comment. I think what's said here is consistent with
23 our last meeting. But I think in our final report, we
24 should change that.

25 MS. TRIBE: So, Randy, your words "seriously

1 consider" is a lot different than whether it's being
2 recommended forward to be analyzed n the EIS.

3 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think when we get to the
4 final report, I would still recommend the language I said in
5 my fourth recommendation, which is basically the same in the
6 previous one.

7 MS. TRIBE: But you're not saying this one --

8 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Not in the report of the
9 September meeting.

10 MS. LEWIS: For clarification, if you look at
11 the first bullet where "The Committee recommends the
12 following for Alternative 2," that is the exact language
13 that came from the September meeting that you, as a
14 committee, put together to "Include priority rehabilitation
15 as an alternative in the environmental document because it
16 provides some sense of baseline, is realistic based on
17 current funding, and includes planning."

18 CHAIRMAN OGLE: It's a little inconsistent
19 with the general statement at the beginning of this report
20 that was put in there but then leaving this EIS business in
21 here. Because I don't think it's part of our mission to be
22 advising the Park Service on the EIS. And therefore, I
23 thought all of these statements throughout here about
24 advising the Park Service on the EIS should be taken out.
25 And it was not done. And I think this is an accurate

1 representation of what we did in September, but I still
2 think we ought to just take out all the business about
3 advising them on the EIS.

4 MS. TRIBE: Even though it says "These
5 alternatives will then be analyzed in an environmental
6 document...."

7 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I just view that as a
8 statement of what's to be done. I don't think that was a
9 part of our mission to advise them on that.

10 MR. O'QUINN: But, Randy, is this not the
11 alternative the best that could be done -- and I get back to
12 my original question about sources -- not sources but amount
13 of funding. If this was all the money you'd get and this is
14 the consequences of how long it's going to take and the
15 impacts for doing it. So realistically, whether we as a
16 committee suggest to the Park Service to include it as an
17 alternative in their study or not, I think they're going to
18 have to. Because if they don't get funded, this is the
19 consequences of how you can go forward.

20 CHAIRMAN OGLE: My point is just that they're
21 apples and oranges. We're advising them on how to
22 rehabilitate the road. They are fully in charge of what
23 happens in the EIS, and we don't have any say about that. I
24 don't even think -- in fact, I tend to think that there
25 might be a greater risk of problems at the end of the EIS

1 process by us advising them on what to do in the EIS
2 process, than if we just stay away from it. So I think we
3 ought to take all of our -- in our final chapter -- final
4 report not advising them what to do.

5 MR. O'QUINN: This is an alternative we
6 evaluated, and they can continue to evaluate it in whatever
7 process they go forward with. And these are the parameters
8 associated with it.

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Uh-huh.

10 MS. LEWIS: I do think it would be very
11 helpful for us if, when we get to chapter four, you
12 construct chapter four that in one of the very first
13 paragraphs you have a statement from the Committee that it
14 intends no influence on the Environmental Impact Statement
15 process. That this stands alone, stands in its own right as
16 recommendations to the Park Service, but is not intended to
17 do anything with the environmental impact.

18 MS. TRIBE: So Suzann, I'd like you to keep
19 track of that, not lose that. Because if we start talking
20 about that now, we'll be off on another road.

21 MR. O'QUINN: The Charter really does give us
22 that. Because it says we'd advise on alternatives, and then
23 it says these alternatives will then be analyzed in an
24 Environmental Impact Statement.

25 MR. BAKER: But there's nothing saying they

1 couldn't pick up the alternative by themselves if it didn't
2 come from the Committee.

3 MS. TRIBE: I think we're talking about two
4 things here. Randy said I'm willing to wait until chapter
5 four where we give our advice from today. And what he's
6 going to suggest when we get there is that Alternative
7 number 2 not be seriously considered, that's all, and that
8 you're willing to put it there. And that this alternative
9 would still go forward as an alternative the Park Service
10 could consider in one way or another, but you just want to
11 give some advice on it.

12 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Right.

13 MS. TRIBE: In the same way we did in the no
14 action.

15 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Right.

16 MS. PAHL: I think we should talk about this
17 during the chapter four conversation.

18 MS. TRIBE: Yes; right. Are you ready to go
19 forward?

20 Anything on page 12?

21 Page 13.

22 MS. PAHL: I don't understand the sentence
23 "This alternative comes with a high cost, as access and
24 weather conditions could reduce overall productivity." I
25 understand the weather factor, but aren't all the

1 alternatives going to be subject to weather and cost
2 fluctuations?

3 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Where you at, Barb?

4 MS. TRIBE: We're on page 13.

5 MS. PAHL: "This alternative comes with a
6 high cost, as access and whether conditions could reduce
7 overall productivity."

8 MS. TRIBE: Could you tell us --

9 MS. PAHL: Sorry. The two documents have
10 different numbers.

11 MS. LEWIS: The pages got renumbered.

12 MS. TRIBE: So is your comment --

13 MS. PAHL: We can wait.

14 MS. TRIBE: Okay; anything on 13?

15 Let's go to page 14. Barbara, did you have a
16 comment?

17 MS. PAHL: I guess that the statement that's
18 made in there, I just wondered if that wasn't true with all
19 of them. I guess that's my question for you, Joe.

20 MR. KRACUM: I can respond to that. The idea
21 there was to extend the construction season but by doing so
22 you have to provide additional cold weather protection and
23 additional snow plowing. That's where that high cost is,
24 more so than in the other alternatives, and that's why it's
25 in that one.

1 MR. BLACK: Joe, I have a question for you on
2 that particular issue, because you have all of June and all
3 of October available to you and including ten days in
4 September available to you. I looked at this and I went
5 Where are we coming up with these higher costs of doing it
6 this way as opposed to doing it with Alternative 3.

7 MR. KRACUM: If you were to -- I'll take your
8 example for June first. It's pretty common knowledge that
9 Mother Nature opens the road; that the maintenance personnel
10 and snow removal do the best they can during the early
11 months of the summer to remove the snow. But with the
12 avalanche hazards and with additional snowfall during that
13 period of time, you really don't have a good sense of how
14 much you're going to be able to get done.

15 In order to use June in some years, you may have
16 to add additional forces in order to clear snow, watch for
17 avalanches, clean avalanches and so forth. That's the
18 difference between those alternatives where you actually
19 make those expenditures rather than waiting to the point,
20 say, in the last part of June or early July.

21 The same goes at the tail end of the season,
22 whereas you don't know when that snowfall is going to occur.
23 So the risk is there, and you have to account for that risk.
24 And in order to account for that risk, we've put additional
25 dollars in there that if you do need it, you could add

1 additional cold weather protection for your work as well as
2 additional snow removal cost in addition to what they're
3 doing now. And that's where that extra cost comes from.

4 MS. LEWIS: If I might, Roscoe, an example
5 might be in June, even after we officially open the road and
6 before we officially close the road, weather oftentimes
7 closes the pass on those shoulder seasons. And I think what
8 he's referring to is that that would not be acceptable,
9 under this alternative, and we would have to fund or put
10 money into or direct a contractor to not sit and wait to see
11 when the weather gets better in June, we'd have to put in
12 the manpower and the equipment and the processes and
13 procedures to go up and remove the ice so they could
14 continue to move construction vehicles. And that's where I
15 understood the added cost would come from. We would have to
16 directly work on getting that road open for the construction
17 and keeping it open for their construction work during those
18 two months, rather than what happens to us now is if -- you
19 know, for the last couple weeks before the road officially
20 closed in October, we had significant ice and snow up at
21 Logan Pass and we had to pull the gates. We couldn't do
22 that under this alternative. We would have to make it
23 passable for the contractor.

24 MS. TRIBE: You would have to make June and
25 October available.

1 MS. LEWIS: Right.

2 MS. TRIBE: Whatever it costs.

3 MS. LEWIS: Right. For the contractor to
4 work, not the visitor.

5 MR. KRACUM: In other words, if you were to
6 make a construction contractor go out for bid and you were
7 to say that the contractor must be on-site and working on
8 June the 1st, he has to build in the cost, in order to make
9 sure that he can get there as well. Because he's going to
10 be bidding it, obviously, before June.

11 MR. BLACK: I fully understand that. But I
12 guess the fact that you're closing the road gives them much
13 better access, even from the 15th of June until the 1st of
14 July and from the 1st of October until the 19th of October,
15 if that's what the closure date is. And what I didn't
16 understand is why we're not getting economies of scale in
17 comparison to Alternative number 3.

18 MR. KRACUM: I'm not sure what -- I'm
19 understanding what you're saying, Roscoe. Ask me that one
20 more time.

21 MR. BLACK: Well, in Alternative 3 you've got
22 closures at night, you have traffic going through if the
23 road opens on the 10th or the 5th or the 8th or whatever it
24 is. In the year when it doesn't open until the 23rd or, you
25 know, those kinds of years, yes, you're not going to have a

1 lot of construction up there. But I guess what I'm saying
2 is why it costs more if you could work in those times other
3 than if you're requiring those guys to be up there on the
4 1st of June, which is probably -- couldn't be done,
5 requiring the contractor to be up there the 1st of June.

6 MR. BABB: I'd like to add something, just so
7 everybody knows. Right now, the current contracts that we
8 have, they can work starting April. And like they're still
9 working up there right now. And as Suzann said, we're
10 paying to keep the road open, as Suzann said, for two weeks
11 ago. I just want to make sure everybody understands that
12 we're doing that now. They can work from April to as long
13 as we can keep the road open safely. Which, if we don't get
14 any snow, could be all the way into December.

15 MR. KRACUM: And the difference is that your
16 construction cost would include the cost for the contractor
17 to actually add additional resources to keep that access
18 open.

19 MS. TRIBE: Even in case.

20 MR. KRACUM: Even in case. Because it would
21 be -- if you bid that job, say, in February, you really
22 don't have a good handle on what's going to happen in June.
23 So in order for the contractor to protect his own interest,
24 he's got to have enough money in there that if you do have a
25 stellar snow year, for instance, and you do have the great

1 fluctuations in temperature and sunshine in June where you
2 have avalanche hazards, he has to have that built in so he's
3 not at risk for that. If he doesn't spend it, he makes the
4 profit. He has to -- if he gets the big snows and he gets
5 the big ice and he gets the big avalanches, he's got the
6 money to take care of it.

7 MR. O'QUINN: Not necessarily he would have
8 to spend it. You get paid by the yard, how much material
9 you use. You've got a unit cost in there. So if he doesn't
10 use it, you don't pay him for it.

11 MR. KRACUM: But he's still got to have the
12 resources.

13 MR. O'QUINN: And it could be the Park
14 Service did it, it could be Park Service furnished or it
15 could be contractor. But the money's going to have to be
16 there from somebody to do it.

17 MS. TRIBE: So, Roscoe, are you okay with
18 that explanation that -- they have to bet on the outcome.

19 MR. BLACK: And I understand that. But why
20 is it any different than somebody bidding it under option 3
21 and having a big snow year on the front and backside of
22 that?

23 MR. KRACUM: Because you're asking the work
24 in June, no matter what, no matter what the situation is.
25 Whereas in the Alternative 3 and the others, the schedule is

1 such that you don't have to do that.

2 MR. BLACK: Then, Joe, my question is, why
3 was there only a year's difference in these, if you're
4 requiring these people to work those two months where in 3,
5 you're saying Work when you can?

6 MR. KRACUM: The sensitivity of doing all of
7 those is a pretty narrow range of time. I mean, you know,
8 it's like you just can't keep throwing more money and more
9 money and getting it shorter and shorter. You can only take
10 off so much time by putting more money to it. We felt that
11 the one -- the Alternative 4, where you give the biggest
12 possible period of time to do it, you're going to need more
13 money in order to make sure that that stays open during
14 those periods.

15 MS. TRIBE: So Roscoe --

16 MR. BLACK: But that still didn't answer the
17 question as to why there was only one year difference
18 between the two alternatives.

19 MR. KRACUM: You still have a
20 requirement -- the amount of work doesn't change.

21 MR. BLACK: I understand that.

22 MR. KRACUM: You've got a block of work. You
23 only have so much time to do it. In June, if you do have
24 additional snow or if you do have the avalanches, your
25 production during June is going to a lot less than it would

1 be if you have it all clear, because you've got time to do
2 that snow removal. And while you're doing the snow removal
3 or the avalanche removal, you don't have time to work during
4 that period. So your productivity is very low. We figured
5 50, 60 percent of the production in June versus production
6 in July.

7 MS. TRIBE: So, Roscoe, we could probably
8 have this discussion for a long time; I'd like the two of
9 you to have it at lunch.

10 MR. BLACK: We can move on.

11 MS. TRIBE: What I was going to ask is, is
12 this an area where, when we get to chapter four, one of the
13 things you might want to bring back up will be the business
14 of would you like to have the contractor look in a closer
15 way at the cost estimates related to Alternative 4 because
16 of the questions you've raised? So we won't try to settle
17 that now. I just don't want you to lose that. You're not
18 tossing this alternative or changing it, you're just saying
19 I'm a little uncomfortable with the costs and I want to make
20 sure they're accurate. These guys are working on estimates.
21 There's no way they can bet one way or another what's going
22 to happen on any of those things, but it's just an area
23 you'd like to highlight the costs related to that
24 alternative. So will you keep track of that.

25 MR. BLACK: I will.

1 MS. TRIBE: Anything else on page 14?

2 MS. STEWART: On that renaming the
3 alternative, that is entirely too long, in my opinion, on
4 the renaming of that. I would at least scratch the word
5 "critical." Because if John Q. Public comes in and reads
6 this title, even with all the things that I've read, I had
7 to read it three times to say What is it saying.

8 MS. TRIBE: Remember, you guys created it
9 last time. And where critical was critical.

10 MR. BAKER: So that may come up in chapter
11 four.

12 MS. TRIBE: You know, what we're looking for
13 are places that have been misinterpreted or wrong. Or
14 places where we want to give specific advice we'll save it
15 to four.

16 Joni, thanks.

17 Anything on 15?

18 Anything on 16? If no one has one, I have one.

19 And I didn't -- it was from the earlier version.
20 And it was the italicized paragraph, the last sentence
21 didn't make sense. "Traffic is unimpeded on the weekends
22 and holidays." Okay; it has been fixed since the version I
23 have.

24 MS. LEWIS: Where are you?

25 MS. TRIBE: On page 16, the italicized

1 paragraph written by the Park Service. This didn't
2 have -- it wasn't separated, and I think it was just a typo
3 before.

4 Anything else on 16?

5 Seventeen? Nice job.

6 Anything on page 18, starting with the heading
7 Elements Common to All Alternatives?

8 MR. BAKER: The one that I had is in my notes
9 I was reading over last night, I thought one of the elements
10 that we were going to include in all the alternatives was
11 the establishment of the foundation funding for maintenance
12 and operation.

13 MS. PAHL: I think that's in here somewhere.

14 MS. LEWIS: We took it directly from the
15 document you produced in September. What I think what
16 you're talking about is over here on the Proposed Actions
17 under the advice related to operations and maintenance is
18 where you might find where that information was captured
19 from your September meeting.

20 MR. BAKER: Okay. But it was, and I looked
21 back into the recap of what Bambi had typed in. It did say,
22 because I made the comment, that we include the
23 establishment of a special fund which should be included in
24 all -- should be as a common element to all alternatives.
25 And that should be in this page.

1 MS. TRIBE: Brian, will you be sure we take
2 that to chapter four?

3 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think what Brian is saying
4 is it ought to be in here as a part of our discussion and
5 recommendation at the last meeting. He thinks it ought to
6 be put in there. And my recollection is the same way. I
7 was in the same small group.

8 MR. BAKER: It is picked up later on in this
9 document, but I think it has to be inserted into page 18.

10 MS. TRIBE: Do we have any problem with that
11 at all?

12 MS. LEWIS: Brian, would you state what you
13 want to be added to page 18.

14 MS. TRIBE: I may have it in my notes too.

15 MS. LEWIS: I think the reason why it didn't
16 get into eighteen to begin with, we didn't capture it in
17 September. So it's important that we stop for a moment and
18 capture it now.

19 MR. BAKER: Okay; here it is here on page 21,
20 the bottom point. "Establish a permanent maintenance
21 endowment fund separate from Glacier National Park's budget
22 that would be used exclusively for road maintenance. It is
23 hoped that income from the fund would be used starting in
24 year eleven."

25 MS. LEWIS: It's already in the document.

1 You'll be able to cut and paste.

2 MS. TRIBE: It came from the alternative
3 discussion, the group that was over here, on that flip
4 chart. And it also came from the alternative. And I think,
5 Lowell, it was part of the group that you were in when you
6 talked about the alternatives, and that's when we talked
7 about pulling it forward, as Brian is saying, to all the
8 alternatives.

9 So if we could just on page 21 take the language
10 that's the last bullet, "Establish a permanent maintenance
11 endowment fund" --

12 MR. BAKER: Actually, the last two points.
13 Because the last point it refers to year 11, which takes off
14 of the previous point in front of it.

15 MS. TRIBE: So that, Mary, they're the last
16 two bullets on page 21.

17 Anything else?

18 Could we go to page 19, please, Proposed Actions.
19 This is the one where we had the most agreement in the
20 easier way last time. So I want you to, again, see if the
21 Park Service has adequately reflected, in their inserted
22 italicized paragraphs, what you think needs to be said
23 there. Anything on 19?

24 Anything on 20?

25 MS. PAHL: I have a question on 20. Did we

1 actually say "restore historic character as practical"? And
2 I guess --

3 MS. LEWIS: Where are you?

4 MS. PAHL: I don't know. I'm getting screwed
5 up by the numbers. I think it's on page 21, not 20.

6 MS. TRIBE: Is it under Road Pavement?

7 MS. PAHL: No. Never mind, again. I'm
8 looking at the wrong page.

9 MS. TRIBE: Looking at road tunnels on page
10 21, where are you on that; the fourth bullet from the
11 bottom?

12 MS. PAHL: I think we kind of talked about
13 where the walls were historic walls were missing how the new
14 walls could be with new technology and then restoring the
15 historical character of the existing walls.

16 MS. TRIBE: I hate to say this, but I think
17 the "practical" was your word.

18 MS. PAHL: Let's keep going, because there's
19 one further on that might be able to address this.

20 MS. LEWIS: I think what is difficult is we
21 lifted -- this document which you had in your hands before
22 you left the meeting in September was taken directly from
23 the flip charts you created. And so they weren't -- it
24 doesn't necessarily reflect all the language and dialogue
25 that you generated during your discussion but it was lifted

1 straight from the flip charts.

2 MS. TRIBE: And I think, Barbara, I remember
3 in the discussion you talked about wanting to be able to use
4 materials that restored the historic character. You did a
5 little diagram on the flip chart, and then in the end you
6 said, You know, I mean within what's practical. And I think
7 that's where the word came from.

8 MS. PAHL: Well, thank goodness there's
9 apparently a big boulder that fell on the road so we have
10 new material to work with.

11 MS. TRIBE: Are we all right on 21?

12 MR. DAKIN: Wait. Boy, I was back on page
13 20; sorry.

14 MS. TRIBE: Just a senior moment, Bill.

15 MR. DAKIN: There's certainly a -- it didn't
16 create a literary masterpiece here. Under Advice Related to
17 Operations & Maintenance, second bullet, "...and annual
18 inspection and evaluation" insert "of" "maintenance-related
19 facility impacts." Can you follow me? It's just
20 unreadable.

21 MS. TRIBE: So "Write and implement a manual
22 of maintenance procedures, especially snow plowing, which
23 includes seasonal and annual inspection and evaluation of
24 maintenance-related facility impacts." And I'm glad you
25 caught that, because that was your sentence and we forgot

1 your "of."

2 MR. DAKIN: Down under Advice Related to
3 Operations & Maintenance, again, the first bullet, at the
4 very end, "Develop an improved Operations & Maintenance
5 Plan," dot, dot, dot, dot, ends with "road maintenance and
6 not" -- I would just insert "for overhead." Because I just
7 had a hard time thinking people would understand this. So
8 that sentence ends "...road maintenance and not for
9 overhead."

10 MR. O'QUINN: Bill, going back while you're
11 doing that, why do you need "facilities,"
12 "maintenance-related impacts"? The previous one.

13 MR. DAKIN: That means maintenance-related
14 impacts on facilities. Maybe that would be a
15 better -- "facilities" there meaning the guardrail, meaning
16 the cultural resources of the road, and that that inspection
17 was to determine whether the maintenance practices of the
18 Park Service had, in effect, had impacts on those
19 facilities.

20 MR. O'QUINN: I don't use the word
21 "facility." I think when you say maintenance facilities,
22 I'm thinking about warehouses and snow storage.

23 MS. TRIBE: Can you help Bill with a word?

24 MR. O'QUINN: I don't think we need a word.
25 I think it's just maintenance-related impacts to the road

1 and the guardrail as part of the road.

2 MR. DAKIN: I guess maybe it would have been
3 better to say resource impacts there, impacts on resource,
4 meaning cultural features of the road. I'm not sure now.
5 Are we able to go back and --

6 MS. TRIBE: So how about -- I mean, this is
7 just cleaning up a sentence, I'm going to take Suzann's
8 lead. This is just cleaning up a sentence. So what if it
9 read, "Write and implement a manual of maintenance
10 procedures, especially snow plowing, which includes seasonal
11 and annual inspection and evaluation of maintenance-related
12 impacts on road features."

13 MR. DAKIN: Fine.

14 And then, again, down at the bottom, under Advice
15 Related to Operations & Maintenance, second bullet, "Develop
16 an improved Operations & Maintenance Plan and develop
17 strategies that ensure future maintenance and operations
18 funds to be spent specifically for on-the-ground road
19 maintenance" --

20 MR. BAKER: And no overhead.

21 MR. DAKIN: "And not for overhead."

22 MS. TRIBE: -- "and not for overhead."

23 Speaking of literary masterpieces.

24 All right; anything else on 20?

25 Twenty-one.

1 MS. LEWIS: Can I make sure that we capture
2 where the two bottom bullets will be moved to page 18 --

3 MR. BAKER: No. They can be kept here on
4 page 21, because it was discussed on page 21. But we wanted
5 to make sure that that was included in general elements.

6 MS. TRIBE: They're not moved to, they're
7 copied to.

8 MS. LEWIS: That was my question. You want
9 them to appear in both places.

10 MS. TRIBE: Page 22, Visitor Development
11 Strategies. Any comments on page 22?

12 Page 23.

13 Page 24.

14 MR. STEWART: I have a comment on 24 under
15 the second part, Local Transportation Coordination, second
16 bullet, "Promote Discussion between Glacier Action...." I
17 think we lost the intent of that.

18 Linda, that was your idea.

19 MS. TRIBE: It's when you guys were talking
20 about how are you going to pull this off.

21 MR. STEWART: And I don't think the intent
22 was for the two entities to discuss together how we would
23 create scenic byways, it was that GAIN would try and promote
24 scenic byways on the east side and that BNESA would
25 concentrate on other areas of the Park. Am I right in what

1 your intent was? I think we need to clarify that.

2 MS. TRIBE: And you think, Joni, some of the
3 discussion, if I remember right, had to do with who had the
4 right to sort of tell people what to do. And that's sort of
5 what led to the "promote" part. So how might we reword that
6 so we get the intent? Or Linda, how might we?

7 MR. STEWART: I think we could probably
8 eliminate "between" and put in "with." Because that was my
9 only confusion on that was that it means that GAIN is
10 supposed to talk to BNESA, and the two of us are supposed to
11 get together on this. And so I think maybe just "with."

12 MS. TRIBE: And "with" could include between
13 also. "So promote discussion with Glacier Action
14 Involvement Now and Burlington Northern Environmental
15 Stewardship Area."

16 Linda, you okay with that?

17 MS. ANDERSON: (Nods head.)

18 MS. TRIBE: Anything else on 24?

19 Twenty-five? Barbara?

20 MS. PAHL: The sentence on the first bullet
21 or the only bullet under Develop Information, you can either
22 say "Working through the Park, develop a plan..." or you
23 should say work -- this isn't "though," but "through." It's
24 a typo. Or you could say "...through the Park to develop a
25 plan...." but you can't keep what you've got.

1 MS. TRIBE: Let's try that one. "Work
2 through the Park to develop a plan." I thought you were
3 going to try to get rid of the cookies, and Linda was going
4 to get really upset.

5 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Since this is all advice to
6 the Park, do we even need this "Working through the Park..."
7 or could we just start with "Develop"?

8 MS. TRIBE: One more time, the only reason
9 this language was in there was because the group didn't feel
10 they could say Park, go do this.

11 MS. PAHL: And you can't do it without the
12 Park.

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: It's just advising the Park
14 go do something, recommending.

15 MS. TRIBE: So you suggest we start with
16 "Develop"?

17 CHAIRMAN OGLE: "Develop."

18 MS. TRIBE: Any problem? So we're starting
19 with "Develop."

20 Anything else on 25?

21 Page 26. All right.

22 Well, I want to say thank you again to the Park
23 Service, because I think that there are people sitting over
24 here that probably did the bulk of this clean-up. And I
25 also want to say thank you to the Committee. You know, you

1 did a heck of a lot of work in two days last time, heck of a
2 lot of work. And it's kind of nice. I kind of liked
3 getting the document in the mail and reading through that.
4 You know, you did a lot of stuff. And it worked pretty
5 well.

6 Now, everybody's not thrilled with all the
7 alternatives. And people have pieces missing and we need to
8 do a little advice work, but I want you to give yourselves a
9 hand. Give yourselves a hand.

10 (Applause.)

11 MS. TRIBE: Could we very quickly -- and I'm
12 going to record this on the flip chart and Mary and Dayna
13 are going to record it as well. For the people that have
14 those promise notes sitting around about advice, could we
15 just get these up here right now so that we don't lose them
16 before we go to lunch?

17 Randy, you had one.

18 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I don't think I have one.
19 Oh, I wanted to get the -- Priority Rehabilitations. I
20 would like to see that changed in our final recommendation
21 that the alternative was examined and dismissed by the
22 Committee because it did not adequately address the needs of
23 the road.

24 MS. TRIBE: This is Alternative 2?

25 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Yes.

1 MS. TRIBE: So what Randy's proposing is that
2 the Committee make a statement that doesn't dismiss the
3 alternative from the EIS, but that the Committee would not
4 see that alternative as one that should be selected.

5 CHAIRMAN OGLE: That's right. That's the.

6 MR. O'QUINN: Taking it one step further, it
7 probably is not going to meet the purpose and need of the
8 project.

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: That's way down the road.
10 We're saying we don't recommend that, but if they don't get
11 funding, they may have to do that. That's not what we're
12 recommending.

13 MR. O'QUINN: And carrying it to the next
14 level, what I would envision them doing is evaluating that
15 against the need and the purpose of what they're doing. And
16 they're saying if we don't get the funding, this is all we
17 can do, it doesn't meet the purpose, it's not a viable
18 alternative, it's off the shelf, it goes away.

19 MS. TRIBE: So on page 11 at the bottom,
20 there's some language related to Alternative 1. And what it
21 says on Alternative 1 is "The Repair as Needed Alternative
22 was examined and dismissed by the Committee because it did
23 not adequately address the needs of the road." It says some
24 other stuff too. Does that go too far, or do you want to
25 say Alternative 2 was examined and the Committee does not

1 believe it should be considered? Suzann.

2 MR. DAKIN: Aren't we saying that we do
3 believe it should be considered but that somehow our
4 conclusion is that, as an alternative, it's inadequate to
5 address the problem; it doesn't meet the purpose of the
6 project. You're not trying to advise the Park not to
7 include that in the range of alternatives, are you, Randy?

8 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Well, it goes back to this
9 advising them on the EIS business. I think we should say a
10 Priority Rehabilitation was examined and dismissed by the
11 Committee as it did not adequately address the needs of the
12 road. Staying away -- they'll probably put it in and
13 consider it in the EIS process, but that's not our purpose.

14 MR. O'QUINN: And they should be able to
15 dismiss it with the same sentence.

16 CHAIRMAN OGLE: If they choose to do that.
17 But as I said earlier, my big concern is I don't want
18 anybody to have the confusion that this Committee
19 recommended a serious consideration of a twenty-year
20 alternative.

21 MR. O'QUINN: I agree. I think it risks the
22 need of what we were sent here to address.

23 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Right.

24 MS. TRIBE: This, by the way, is called
25 getting to consensus backwards. It actually is a tool.

1 So Alternative 2 was examined and dismissed
2 because the Committee felt it was inadequate to meet the
3 needs of the road.

4 MR. BAKER: Does not meet purpose and --

5 MS. TRIBE: It can be cleaned up.

6 MR. O'QUINN: Part of that EIS, when they get
7 to doing it, is the purpose and need.

8 MS. LEWIS: That's a whole separate document.

9 MS. TRIBE: So, Randy, does this meet your
10 intent?

11 CHAIRMAN OGLE: That's what my intent is.

12 MS. TRIBE: Do we have any problems with
13 this? All it says is --

14 MR. DAKIN: I guess my one suggestion would
15 be, I'm not comfortable with the word "dismissed," but would
16 be more comfortable if it said was examined and found
17 unfavorable. Because I'm not sure I feel like we should say
18 dismiss this. Because after all, if there is no money, this
19 is the only option that they would have.

20 MR. O'QUINN: Good point.

21 MR. DAKIN: Inadequate?

22 MS. TRIBE: I think we can say Alternative 2
23 was examined and found to be inadequate to meet the needs of
24 the road.

25 CHAIRMAN OGLE: That's fine.

1 MR. DAKIN: Uh-huh.

2 MS. LEWIS: Can you rewrite that so it can be
3 captured accurately, please?

4 MR. O'QUINN: Because it is going to go
5 forward as an alternative in our report, is it not?

6 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think just this language
7 will go forward.

8 MR. O'QUINN: But there's going to be a
9 description of Alternative 2.

10 MS. LEWIS: It will be in chapter three.

11 MR. BAKER: But when it comes to chapter
12 four, this is what it's going to say.

13 MS. LEWIS: That will be included.

14 MR. BAKER: Maybe we should say re-examined
15 then.

16 MS. TRIBE: But we haven't re-examined it.
17 Alternative 2 was examined and the Committee felt it was
18 inadequate to meet the needs of the road. Any problem? Any
19 problem from the Committee?

20 Okay; Fred, did you have a comment?

21 MR. BABB: I do think it should read
22 Alternative -- sort of repeat the title.

23 MS. TRIBE: That's why I put dot, dot, dot.
24 I'm figuring they're getting that over there. This is the
25 Repair as Needed.

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: No, it's Priority
2 Rehabilitation.

3 MS. TRIBE: All right.

4 Randy, that was all you were holding?

5 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Yes.

6 MS. TRIBE: Anybody holding anything as we
7 go?

8 MR. BAKER: There was one on the renaming of
9 the new alternative.

10 MS. TRIBE: I'm going to go right around
11 Brian. Roscoe.

12 MR. DAKIN: Mine's when we get into the final
13 shot.

14 MS. TRIBE: That's where we are. Now, you
15 will have another time to say some additional things, but I
16 just want to make sure we don't lose these before we go to
17 lunch.

18 MR. BLACK: That was on Alternative 4.

19 MS. TRIBE: Name it for me, please.

20 MR. BLACK: Extended Rehabilitation Season.
21 What we're trying to determine is the cost versus
22 Alternative 3, with a better explanation of the costs. I
23 guess it would be a better explanation of the costs and
24 rehabilitation duration.

25 MS. TRIBE: Okay. So what you would like to

1 have the Committee recommend as part of the final advice is
2 that under Alternative 4, the Extended Rehab Season, you
3 would like the contractors to revise it, the costs of number
4 4, in relationship to number 3 and better explain the costs
5 and rehabilitation duration.

6 MR. BLACK: Explain the cost differences.

7 MS. TRIBE: Cost differences?

8 MR. BLACK: It's also duration differences.

9 The difference in cost and --

10 MS. LEWIS: Virginia, if I may, and I don't
11 have -- I don't know if this would influence the wording of
12 this. But we have no more mechanisms by which to extend the
13 contractor's work on these studies. Now, what we can do
14 with that recommendation is carry it forward in the EIS. If
15 we carry forward these figures and these cost estimates and
16 duration, we know from the Committee that if we carry them
17 forward, we need to go back and answer that question during
18 the EIS process and see whether or not it would change. But
19 we would not do it as part of the studies that have
20 now -- is that -- I want to make sure that that's
21 understandable.

22 We have no opportunity left, from a funding
23 standpoint, to now direct the contractor to go back and do
24 more work on the studies which have been finalized. But we
25 can address that -- and, again, that's the beauty of this

1 Committee. That's a very good piece of advice of things we
2 want to look for if we -- when we carry this information
3 forward in an EIS process.

4 MR. BLACK: I think even on page 14, there
5 is, under the "Improve this alternative by..." and then it
6 says "making cost estimates more comprehensive." I'm not
7 sure that that isn't exactly what we're talking about here.

8 MS. TRIBE: Would you read it again, please?

9 MR. BLACK: It's already in the --

10 MS. LEWIS: It's already in the document,
11 Virginia.

12 MS. TRIBE: So you're saying it's already in
13 the document, we don't have to add it?

14 MR. BLACK: The only thing we might want to
15 add is where the variance comes in between this and
16 Alternative 3.

17 MS. TRIBE: So what we've said here is, as
18 part of the EIS process, revisit the costs of Alternative 4
19 in relationship to Alternative 3; is that right? And more
20 thoroughly explain the differences in costs and rehab
21 duration between the two alternatives. Is that what you're
22 looking for?

23 MR. BLACK: Randy, as long as we're not,
24 again, advising them on the EIS.

25 MS. TRIBE: Well, you know, we probably could

1 have a long discussion about what this means, this last
2 sentence, about -- and we're sort of using it all over the
3 place when we need it. So all you're saying is that as a
4 Committee member, part of the advice you'd like to see is
5 that this cost business on 3 and 4 is as clear as possible.

6 MR. BLACK: Right.

7 MS. LEWIS: Especially in light of the fact
8 that the Committee's major recommendation is to combine 3
9 and 4.

10 MR. JEWETT: Is the exercise we're going
11 through actually giving advice on how to change or how to
12 make these clearer?

13 MS. TRIBE: No. The only thing we're doing
14 right this minute is asking the people that we asked to hold
15 onto that comment when we were going through the pages, get
16 them documented up here. After lunch we're going to come
17 back, and we will have an opportunity, not to go back to the
18 alternatives necessarily, but to offer additional advice.
19 And it might be about the alternatives.

20 MR. JEWETT: Got it; thank you.

21 MR. STEWART: Mine was just can we add to the
22 statement that they're making cost estimates more
23 comprehensive and comparing to -- what was it, Alternative 3
24 somehow? Just add a little bit to that instead of --

25 MS. TRIBE: So on the bottom of page 14 where

1 it says "Making cost estimates more comprehensive" --

2 MR. STEWART: "And comparing in relationship
3 to Alternative 3."

4 MS. TRIBE: Well, would it hurt, do you
5 think, to add this to the final advice?

6 MR. BAKER: It already is Alternative 3.

7 MS. TRIBE: Right. But all Roscoe is asking
8 is that it be highlighted. If it doesn't hurt anything,
9 then couldn't it be forwarded in the advice? Anybody have
10 any problem with that?

11 Now, you didn't save it, but we fixed it when we
12 were there; right?

13 MS. PAHL: I'm fine.

14 MR. STEWART: And I don't know if you want to
15 do it right now, but it was the rename the alternative.

16 MS. TRIBE: Let's try to rename that sucker
17 before we go to lunch.

18 Bill?

19 MR. DAKIN: I had the exact same thing, and I
20 just deleted the Where Critical.

21 MR. BAKER: Or just call it the extended
22 comprehensive shared use.

23 MR. STEWART: I like that.

24 MS. TRIBE: So we would --

25 MS. PAHL: That's not going to work.

1 MR. STEWART: We understand it but --

2 MS. TRIBE: We would rename Alternative 4
3 to --

4 MS. LEWIS: It's renaming -- the Committee
5 took an action to come up with one name for two
6 alternatives.

7 MR. BAKER: For the combined alternatives.

8 MS. PAHL: In reading the public, how they're
9 responding, and I know there's some confusion about the
10 numbers, but I think they're pretty separate on choices and
11 they're just referring to shared use.

12 MS. TRIBE: So we could say Shared use with
13 extended construction season.

14 MS. PAHL: That's better than what you had
15 before. Why don't we use that as the working title. But
16 anything we can do -- because I do perceive we have a huge
17 communication problem. And whatever we do, I think we want
18 to make it as clear as possible what we're talking about.

19 MS. BURCH: You could call it the win win.

20 MR. BAKER: So what you're saying is just
21 calling it the shared use.

22 MS. PAHL: Maybe. I don't have a problem
23 with going with the longer one at 11:50 Thursday morning.

24 MR. O'QUINN: And the next generation, it
25 will get different names, different numbers, whatever.

1 MS. TRIBE: So for right now, we're going to
2 call it Shared Use.

3 MS. PAHL: With Extended Construction Season.

4 MS. TRIBE: Did you use the word
5 "construction"?

6 MS. PAHL: Hey, rehabilitation requires
7 construction season.

8 MS. TRIBE: Shared Use With Extended
9 Construction Season.

10 CHAIRMAN OGLE: That's fine.

11 MS. TRIBE: Who's the sharing as a member of
12 the public?

13 MS. PAHL: The public and the workers are
14 sharing the road. And I think the public gets that from how
15 they're responding.

16 --o0o--

17 Whereupon all Committee members were asked, by
18 Suzann Lewis, to gather for a group photograph outside the
19 meeting building.

20 (Proceedings in recess from 11:55 a.m. to
21 1:00 p.m.)

22 Ms. Tribe calls the meeting back to order after
23 lunch. She mentions she got feedback from Dayna Hudson
24 regarding formatting of this report during the lunch break,
25 and she and Ms. Hudson make their recommendations to the

1 Committee members.

2 They will eliminate a chapter, first and foremost.
3 So instead of there being Roman numeral seven, you're going
4 to drop to six, because chapter three is eliminated as it
5 stands and a new chapter three will be created, which is the
6 final advice and recommendation, as there is no reason to
7 have a draft chapter. Chapter three, as it now exists, is
8 moved, with no changes as it stood, to an appendix, and then
9 the changes that have been discussed becomes the first part
10 of chapter four, Final Advice and Recommendations, H.

11 Ms. Tribe also mentions that the court reporter
12 was just hoping, as a member of the public and a support for
13 this committee, that when its final recommendations are
14 written, that somebody recommends that you start off, just
15 as Suzann suggested, by making a comment about, from the
16 beginning, this Committee did not think that the road should
17 be closed.

18 Ms. Pahl refers back to one of the public comments
19 made this morning as the way in which the road's described
20 should be about road openings, not about road closings so
21 that it's articulated to the public on the website or
22 anywhere, just say the road's open these times. And the
23 road's never closed. So the road is open or not open. So
24 instead of the road is open from day to day to day, always
25 use the word "open," never use the word "closed."

1 Ms. Tribe then addresses what is left for the
2 Committee to do. She wants to give the Committee the
3 opportunity to have some smaller group discussion and
4 present any additional advice, in addition to the
5 alternatives it wants to give to the National Park Service.
6 And then within the small groups, she wants each group to
7 come to agreement on either a ranking of the alternatives
8 from each group's perspective or a preferred alternative to
9 present to the Park Service.

10 MR. JEWETT: I had a question that I wasn't
11 going to ask earlier, but we're on the topic now and I'd
12 like to visit with Suzann a little bit.

13 How -- can you describe to me how you think the
14 Park Service is going to, outside of the alternatives you've
15 got a whole wide set of advice items with categorical
16 visitor use, and which represents to me the real body of
17 information and thought, how do you anticipate the Park
18 Service using that information as you go through the process
19 and integrate it.

20 MS. LEWIS: Fred can also comment on it, but
21 my instincts tell me, alternatively, that most alternatives
22 in an EIS process are multi-layered. And we would take
23 these same major categories or major value areas,
24 engineering, visitor experience, transportation,
25 socioeconomic, all those topics and they would be the layers

1 inside any given alternative. The challenge will be, as it
2 is always when you're putting out a set of draft
3 alternatives to the public, is to be able to draw
4 distinctions between each alternative. Because we know that
5 if we don't do that, they aren't truly an alternative. So
6 that's, I think, how the advice that's in here and the depth
7 of knowledge we get from the reports gives us an advantage
8 because we did look at ways how to construct alternatives
9 using all those broad categories. You're not going to see
10 an EIS that only puts forth a set of engineering
11 alternatives. Wouldn't meet the intent of NEPA. This is a
12 major undertaking. Even Barney's characterization this
13 morning of this being a major road maintenance project
14 rather than what he gets involved with which is building
15 roads or majorly rebuilding roads where you have to look at
16 should you rebuild the road or not, should you relocate the
17 road, none of that was on the table for this process because
18 the GMP had already been done for the Park and made those
19 decisions in a NEPA process backed up by public comment. So
20 that's why we never got around to well, you know, maybe we
21 should just move this road somewhere else. The GMP kind of
22 gave the parameters in that. So is that answering your
23 question? I think you'll see that we will have layers
24 inside each alternative that are consistent between the
25 alternatives, in terms of names or categories, but we have

1 to -- those all have to be distinctive. They have to stand
2 alone for comparison purposes. Fred, am I --

3 MR. JEWETT: The alternatives, right now,
4 describe different mechanical ways to get at rehabilitating
5 the road. And they don't include, as a part of that, issues
6 related to visitor use or interpretation or extended
7 opportunities through X, Y and Z or long-term stuff that is
8 a part of these other bits of -- these other lawyers of
9 information that we're about to start talking about. So I
10 think what I'm hearing you say, which is what I somewhat
11 anticipated, is that you will flavor the alternatives as
12 they develop by integrating those considerations into it as
13 an overall strategy in each alternative. Is that right?

14 MS. LEWIS: Yes. I think the difference is
15 that the focus of the -- the focus is, though, on all the
16 other subcategories, let's call them, of each alternative.
17 The main focus is to rehab the road.

18 MR. JEWETT: Right.

19 MS. LEWIS: So when we address visitor
20 experience and we address transportation and we address
21 socioeconomic, they're all going to be focused on rehabing
22 the road; beginning it, doing it, ending it. And products,
23 which might be something that you're interested in, what
24 does that mean at the end of the nine years for visitor
25 experience, transportation? We can't use this planning

1 process to ultimately answer those questions, but we will
2 have to show how the visitor experience will change during
3 the course of rehabing and what it will be at the end. Does
4 that make sense?

5 MS. TRIBE: So, Suzann, the information
6 that's coming to you beyond the information about how
7 different segments in the guardrails and -- the specifics
8 for reconstruction or rehab, all the other things that come
9 will be included in the alternatives. And as Tony said,
10 you'll look at different versions of that stuff to flavor
11 and make each alternative distinct.

12 MS. LEWIS: Right.

13 MS. TRIBE: And that this project tears to,
14 if you will, the management plan for the Park. But that was
15 the first umbrella environmental document, now this is a
16 piece in How do you do the road.

17 MS. LEWIS: Right.

18 MS. TRIBE: So going back to Tony's comments,
19 again, I'm thinking that at the end, if you had this
20 alternative flavored this way, this one, this one, this one,
21 all those pieces, the subcategories the public might say We
22 like this part of this one and this part of this one and
23 this part of this one. And the final alternative, the final
24 decision might be an aggregation of this and this and a
25 tossing out of this. And the final alternative might look

1 different than anything, than any of the alternatives in
2 there.

3 MS. LEWIS: Very typically, it often does. I
4 think in an example in an EIS -- let's use visitor
5 transportation as an example. Obviously, we'll have an
6 alternative, a No-Action Alternative, which, in essence,
7 would say visitor transportation is exactly what it is now,
8 red buses and some white buses. Actually, it's more. We
9 could anticipate it is more than it is now because we know
10 that the red buses are coming back. But another alternative
11 would put emphasis on 16-minute -- what are those called;
12 headways?

13 MR. O'QUINN: Suzann, are you sure you want
14 to go there in your EIS?

15 MS. LEWIS: We don't have any choice, Barney,
16 from our legal standpoint.

17 MR. O'QUINN: That's not what you're here to
18 address. The rehabilitation of the road has to be done
19 irrespective of whether you use a transit alternative or a
20 highway use, as it is now.

21 MS. TRIBE: Well, what I don't want to do is
22 debate on how the EIS is going to look.

23 MR. O'QUINN: You're getting into Park use
24 rather than the likeness of the road.

25 MS. TRIBE: Barney, maybe you'd like to visit

1 with Suzann about that.

2 MR. O'QUINN: I would. But I think it gets
3 into what some of Tony's question is.

4 MS. LEWIS: I think the first statement I
5 made is what drives the EIS is the rehabilitation of the
6 road not visitor transportation.

7 MR. O'QUINN: So I don't think it would be
8 quite true to suggest, and I may be wrong. You may get
9 there, but I don't think when you get down to doing that
10 EIS, you're going to get into a real question of closing the
11 road to private vehicles and using all transit as an
12 alternative.

13 MS. LEWIS: No.

14 MR. O'QUINN: Because I don't think that's
15 what this project is all about.

16 MS. LEWIS: Legally, we can't do that,
17 because that question has already been asked and answered
18 under a legal process in the General Management Plan. So,
19 again, we don't go outside that scope.

20 MS. TRIBE: I'm going to say there are
21 probably lots of people at the table that would like to make
22 comments on the EIS. And what I'd like to do is sort of see
23 if we can park that one for a while. And I'm not saying
24 take it out in the hall or the alley, I just mean there
25 might be a time when you could do that later so that we

1 could be able to move on with that. Barney, is that okay
2 with you?

3 MR. O'QUINN: That's fine.

4 MR. BAKER: This morning when we were going
5 through the draft alternatives, we were told that we were
6 just going through them to make sure they were structurally
7 correct, we would be able to address them in the afternoon
8 in the final decisions, if there were any changes to be
9 made. Are we going to be able to do that?

10 MS. TRIBE: Well, address them in terms of if
11 you had an additional idea, if you had that kind of thing,
12 but not open the alternatives again and change them.
13 Because we made an agreement last time that these would be
14 the alternatives that would go forward.

15 MR. O'QUINN: But the recommendations are
16 being made today.

17 MS. TRIBE: That we weren't going to open the
18 alternatives up again as far as Well, I don't want this one,
19 let's build the loop in. The construction of the
20 alternatives. We weren't going to do that. That we would
21 make comments on it this afternoon and that we
22 would -- maybe we have some words that would be better,
23 maybe we have another addition to the bullets under them.
24 But as far as starting over on the alternatives --

25 MR. BAKER: But there may be certain points

1 in the alternatives that you may want to change certain
2 words or whatever?

3 MS. TRIBE: Give it a try.

4 So I think the best thing we could do is get
5 started and see where we come out. And I'm going to give
6 you a pretty limited amount of time to do that. You were
7 created in a random. Suzann will not participate.

8 So I'm going to ask you if you would please grab a
9 flip chart up here and some markers and I'll give you 30
10 minutes to do this and no more.

11 The first task is there additional advice you want
12 to list and bring to the group. Second, I want your best
13 shot at agreement and agreement I put for example or i.e.,
14 if you want to bring in a consensus agreement that this is
15 the best alternative among what's there, great. If you want
16 to suggest that it's a preferred, great. If you want to
17 rank them, although we hardly have enough to rank. And if
18 you want to give us the top three, although we only have two
19 left. But I want you to think about not necessarily having
20 to shake hands and be blood brothers together about it. I
21 want you to give your best shot at agreement on what you
22 think would be the recommended alternative or alternatives
23 on the Committee; okay? Ready, set, go. It's 1:30. You
24 have until two o'clock. You have until 2:15, but by 2:15
25 you have had to have had your break, be back at the table

1 and your stuff written on the flip chart; okay?

2 (Whereupon at 1:30 p.m. the subcommittees commence
3 their group discussion until 2:15 p.m. when they give their
4 presentation.)

5 MS. TRIBE: Okay; could we start with group
6 number 1, please.

7 MS. STEWART: On our additional advice, we
8 advised that the National Park Service appoint a steering
9 committee.

10 Second, no total road closure. And we qualified
11 that with we think the National Park Service needs to come
12 up with language that quells public fears of the road being
13 closed.

14 We also have on here, revisit the socioeconomic
15 data. By that, we mean that we think that you should
16 address David's concerns on maybe some of those numbers are
17 wrong.

18 We also thought that you should revisit the
19 estimations regarding the duration costs. And do you want
20 to add anything to that, Tony? Is that clear enough, do you
21 think?

22 MR. JEWETT: Yeah. We talked about the fact
23 that we thought the underlying assumptions -- that we should
24 revisit the underlying assumptions as you go into the NEPA
25 process as to how many years it would take and how much it

1 would cost, simply because a number of the people on the
2 Committee thought that it was maybe looked at differently.

3 MS. TRIBE: Joni, would mind adding the two
4 words "underlying assumptions" under there? Thanks.

5 MS. STEWART: We think that the National Park
6 Service needs to retain a public relations firm, and we want
7 to reemphasize the need for maintenance. We know it's
8 elsewhere in the documents, but we feel that that needs to
9 be restressed, as far as our concerns.

10 We also think -- they picked the shortest person
11 to present.

12 Built into every alternative the visitor use cost.
13 And as a very last one, we want you to develop an aggressive
14 shuttle system. And on B, we did come to a consensus, all
15 six in our group, agreed that we need to have 3/4, the
16 Shared Use preference. That is our preference. And that
17 was unanimous.

18 MR. JEWETT: I think it's important to add to
19 that that I didn't hear -- I didn't say it, that the
20 elements of shared use were my preference. I said that the
21 solution tied in a Shared Use Alternative. But the elements
22 of that alternative as currently constructed did not satisfy
23 what I thought would be my preference.

24 CHAIRMAN OGLE: We either have five out of
25 six or six out of six for our committee, so I think that's

1 consensus, maybe five out of six.

2 MS. STEWART: Solution lies in Shared Use.
3 What was the rest of your comments?

4 MR. JEWETT: I wanted to make sure that my
5 position was clear.

6 MS. TRIBE: So you're saying that you're not
7 standing up and saying I'm having a parade in support of the
8 current 3/4. I believe that the philosophy of shared
9 use -- within that lies an alternative that will work.

10 MR. JEWETT: That was what I said. And
11 that's also what I heard other people say, although I won't
12 speak for them.

13 MS. STEWART: And I think what the consensus
14 was jumping back once again to what we have in the purple.
15 That if all these issues are addressed in the Shared Use,
16 then it becomes -- is that right, Tony?

17 MR. JEWETT: I'm sorry?

18 MS. STEWART: That if all these issues that
19 we talked about up above in our additional advice, if
20 they're addressed within the Shared Use.

21 MR. JEWETT: They were certainly things that
22 we identified in order to make the Shared Use Alternative
23 begin to flush itself out and get to some of the core issues
24 that all of us identified were important to get in there,
25 yeah.

1 MS. TRIBE: Okay; questions.

2 MS. MOE: I was just going to -- I was one of
3 the people that agreed with Tony's position with the
4 clarification.

5 MS. TRIBE: So with those purple things, if
6 the Park Service was willing to take a look at those, that
7 the strategy of Shared Use is the one you support, but you
8 think it needs a lot of work.

9 MS. MOE: Yes.

10 MS. LEWIS: I just have to ask for some
11 clarification. When you say "it needs a lot of work, "
12 does that mean that your assumption is we would take that
13 Alternative 3 and 4 and literally just do a formatting thing
14 to combine them, and you would expect to see them in the EIS
15 that way?

16 MR. JEWETT: I think -- from my perspective,
17 Suzann, I think you needed to get three or four different
18 alternatives out of those.

19 MS. LEWIS: That's what I needed to hear.

20 MS. TRIBE: Well, that's an interesting way
21 to look at it. What he said is We may be able to get three
22 or four alternatives out of an EIS Shared Use, the things
23 that go into it -- what's the other part of 4?

24 What's the other half of Shared Use?

25 MS. LEWIS: Extended Construction Season.

1 MS. TRIBE: So Shared Use and Extended
2 Construction Season could yield three or four different
3 alternatives. But it sounds like from this group, the
4 shared use philosophy is the one that they are in agreement
5 with, the philosophy. Okay; right?

6 MS. PAHL: I like a lot of what you have up
7 there, and our committee had some similar recommendations.
8 I guess the one question I have, and I know we all -- well,
9 I'm jumping the gun a little bit.

10 But we also talked about the PR and cost. So it
11 may be that we need time, as we go through all these, to
12 look at what are the additional suggestions we have that are
13 going to cost money that currently aren't considered in the
14 budget to see how that's helpful or maybe not helpful to the
15 cause of moving this forward. I'd like to just revisit that
16 before we wrap.

17 MS. TRIBE: So let's look at them all and
18 then go back and do that. We'll talk about where it's
19 probably sort of an impossibility to ever get the money or
20 it would cost a lot of money, you just want to see --

21 MS. PAHL: I just want to have a little
22 discussion around that. Because I'm hoping we can conclude
23 this meeting with a strong recommendation that this really
24 needs to go forward and it's important to do the work and
25 not make it sound like we've added so many burdens to it

1 that the message is Don't go forward. I just want to see
2 how it all sorts out.

3 MS. TRIBE: Thank you, Barbara.

4 Thank you, Barney, agreement right here. I want
5 everybody to note that. Didn't you agree?

6 MR. O'QUINN: That was Don. He told me where
7 to go fishing.

8 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Where did he say?

9 MR. O'QUINN: I'm not telling you.

10 MS. TRIBE: Could we go to group number two.

11 MS. STEWART: Just for the record, I'd like
12 you to know that you've made Don blush three times today.

13 MS. BURCH: Here's our advice. We were
14 looking, starting out with maybe consensus building and
15 so -- and this ties in with what Barb was just saying.

16 I think this is a fundamental thing that this
17 Committee has actually done, and that is we really think the
18 road needs to be rehabilitated. I think we could have
19 looked at the data and said It's beyond repair. As Barney
20 said, It's in need of repair, but it's not past repair. So
21 we wanted the public to hear that strong -- or everybody
22 strongly.

23 Second is encourage the Park Service to actively
24 work with public, commercial, private, nonprofit, and tribal
25 organizations to create a proactive public information and

1 marketing program to offset the negative effects of road
2 rehabilitation.

3 And finally, encourage the Park Service to use a
4 stakeholder or a steering, whichever phrase you prefer,
5 committee in their community public involvement process. So
6 those were --

7 MS. TRIBE: So before you flip your page,
8 what would you notice about this list compared to the other
9 list? Real similar. I mean, there are additional things in
10 the one from before, but there are three major things that
11 are very much the same.

12 MS. BURCH: And we did come out with a
13 preference. We have five members in our group. Tom was
14 asked not to vote, and the rest of us --

15 MR. O'QUINN: Not by us.

16 MS. TRIBE: You asked him not to vote?

17 MS. BURCH: No. His response organization
18 asked him not to vote.

19 But the rest of us supported 3/4. And we do think
20 we should send forward four alternatives for the EIS
21 process. We recognize that more data may come out of that
22 EIS process. But basically, ours came down to problems with
23 each of the other alternatives. Number 1 doesn't meet the
24 purpose and need of the road. Number 2 is inadequate. And
25 number 5, we thought, based on public input, was

1 unacceptable. And our resident expert also thought it was
2 questionable as practical -- as a practical construction
3 method.

4 MS. TRIBE: Which person was the resident
5 expert?

6 MS. BURCH: Our engineer.

7 MR. O'QUINN: Seriously, with 5, I questioned
8 whether you can build a road or do major improvements and
9 telling the contractor that you can work during the week but
10 you got to have it back open on the weekend. Because we're
11 going to spend so much time closing down and opening back up
12 that I think if you're going with 5, you're really going
13 with an extended closure with the notion that you're going
14 to keep Logan Pass open one way or the other but not saying
15 we've got to reopen the road every weekend. Do you agree
16 with that, Joe?

17 MR. KRACUM: Yeah.

18 MR. JEWETT: On number 5, now that you've
19 come out of the closet, I like your Shared Use Alternative.
20 I would like to revisit number 5 a little bit because number
21 5 really was the embodiment of a large number of folks that
22 thought it should be done quickly in the least amount of
23 time. And I went through an exercise with Roscoe and other
24 people to try to define that in a way that was palatable
25 last time, and 5 got kind of stabbed back out as opposed to

1 making it more palatable.

2 And I would throw this out, that I think it is
3 important for this Committee to honor large blocks of public
4 opinion and not turn our backs to it. And whereas this is
5 not the right way to do it, perhaps, the concept of getting
6 it done as quickly as possible does not lose ground, in
7 terms of what the public's interested in.

8 MS. BURCH: I think we sort of touched on
9 that in our group in that we felt that the 3/4 combination
10 was respectful of getting the project done in a reasonable
11 amount of time but was without the risk of having the
12 closure -- a closure word attached to it. And so I agree.

13 And the only thing I would say is, on number 5,
14 what the public's perception of Get it done fast is -- may
15 not be what this Committee has --

16 MR. JEWETT: And so we ought to advise the
17 Park Service to put a 5 alternative together in a way that
18 it addresses that concern in a more realistic manner,
19 perhaps.

20 MS. TRIBE: And you are suggesting that 5
21 goes forward in the analysis.

22 MR. O'QUINN: Yes.

23 MS. BURCH: Yeah, it has to.

24 MS. PAHL: I think to the comment you just
25 made, because I did today read all these letters that we

1 just got from the public, and I actually think the majority
2 of them supported the Shared Use. A couple were. But I
3 kept trying to figure out this idea that quick is like two
4 or three years as opposed to six to eight as one of the
5 quickest.

6 And somebody had suggested that that had come from
7 the General Management Plan. So I do think people are
8 hanging onto that definition. So I think we are doing
9 justice to the information that we have that perhaps hasn't
10 been shared with the public to understand that there is no
11 quick way.

12 MR. JEWETT: We had exactly this discussion
13 at our last meeting and the fact that there is this
14 credibility gap. Because you're exactly right, there's this
15 number floating out of two or three and yet the new
16 information says five to six.

17 MS. PAHL: Six to eight.

18 MR. JEWETT: And it's never been clarified.
19 And it should be clarified in an alternative.

20 MS. PAHL: Which is why we're talking about
21 hiring a PR person.

22 MR. O'QUINN: Tony, in that regard, I think 2
23 is a slow death. Because it's going to take -- drag on so
24 long that people will get so fed up with so much
25 construction for so long in the Park that it will just kill

1 itself.

2 5 is really, I don't think, practical from
3 the -- and I think this needs to be developed in the
4 environmental document. I think that the caveat we put on 5
5 was open it on the weekends. I'm not sure -- and some of
6 these alternatives, like you said with 3/4 will be
7 subalternatives. We've really got three concepts. We got
8 the -- I don't want to say closure, but lengthiest periods
9 of time where the contractor's got use of the road. Then
10 you've got the shared concept which, I think, you've got
11 subsets on those. And the longer process has got subsets on
12 those. But to do 3/4, I think, is going to still require
13 some fairly long periods of time where the contractor's
14 going to have to have access, and you're not going to be
15 able to go from one side of the road or one end to the
16 other. But I think the important thing that I'm getting out
17 of this is that Logan Pass needs to be kept open. It's all
18 going to have to be further developed, I think.

19 MS. TRIBE: And, you know, when the
20 Environmental Impact Statement writer starts to put all this
21 together, even if he has 15,000 of them under his belt,
22 which means that he started when you were -- before he was
23 born, he's going to have to develop those alternatives in a
24 way that both of you are talking about. And the most useful
25 thing that can happen for him is to hear this conversation.

1 Your recommendations are going forward, but you
2 know that you can't write everything down that's involved in
3 this conversation unless you go back and look at Bambi's
4 exact minutes.

5 MR. O'QUINN: And she has trouble with my
6 words. She has trouble with my language.

7 MS. TRIBE: Well, she wanted you to speak
8 English, first of all.

9 MR. O'QUINN: That's what I'm saying.

10 MS. TRIBE: So when we looked to the people
11 who prepared this, the environmental document, this is real
12 valuable conversation for them to hear. Because I think
13 they would like you to realize that there are subsets to
14 every one of these. And basically what you have determined,
15 is that the most acceptable philosophy, at least for two
16 groups so far, is that we have the best or most appropriate
17 balance we can that allows the visitor to still be here; we
18 have some mitigation things to back that up, and that the
19 contractors, the engineers can get their job done. Because
20 they are spending the taxpayer dollar. And, by the way,
21 we're all the taxpayer. So it's kind of an interesting
22 thing where we're coming out.

23 Susie, thanks to your group.

24 Could we go to the third group, please. Do you
25 have a spokesperson?

1 MR. BAKER: Right here.

2 Additional advice, number 1, the road is open,
3 never closed. We want to always emphasize that the glass is
4 half full.

5 MS. TRIBE: Was Barbara in your group?

6 MS. PAHL: Yes.

7 MR. BAKER: Number 2, request line-item
8 budget dollars from Congress for up-front dollars on a PR
9 campaign. Example, it could be part of the NEPA dollars.
10 It should correctly communicate to the public how the
11 Going-to-the-Sun is going to be rehabilitated. That should
12 be its main message.

13 Number 3, with the exception of the Charter legal
14 wording, the term "rehabilitation" must be emphasized, and
15 that reasons why the Committee chose this terminology shift
16 on page 5. So we still want to emphasize rehabilitation,
17 but we can't use it in the Charter legal wording.

18 Number 4, we felt, as did the others, that the
19 Advisory Committee role should be extended within, possibly,
20 the existing mandates, steering committee, advisory
21 committee, whatever. We felt there should be something to
22 go forward into this next stage that provides a little bit
23 of continuity on organized public input. That was all of
24 our new advice.

25 And preferences, 3/4 is it. Shared use. It's a

1 reasonable cost, public accessible, it's the best balance of
2 all the alternatives that we've looked at. It's reasonable.
3 We felt that was a high selling point.

4 We felt that Alternative 5, with regards to the
5 closures, a lot of that closure language is actually already
6 in 3/4. Example, lengthy closure times to do scaling,
7 et cetera. It's already in there. What it does get away
8 from is total road closure. So we unanimously agreed 3/4.

9 MS. TRIBE: Okay. What do you think?

10 What do you think, Anna Marie?

11 MS. MOE: I think that one of the things that
12 our group talked about was something that Barney mentioned
13 this morning. And, again, to say that, you know, we're
14 talking about our preferred alternative is the combined 3/4.
15 Again, it's based upon information that we have today, and
16 to stress that as we carry this forward.

17 MS. TRIBE: So you're suggesting that we say
18 something like At this time, and with the information
19 available to us, the Committee -- I'm just thinking out loud
20 here -- prefers a Shared Use/Extended Construction Season
21 approach. Is that right, Barbara?

22 MS. PAHL: I think we've got to get rid of
23 the "extended construction season." Just refer to it as the
24 shared use. I feel like today is the beginning of
25 articulating a positive, that the project is important, it's

1 doable, it's reasonable, and start moving forward on a
2 positive note to communicate the results of all the
3 deliberation that we've been doing and what we've come to
4 conclude at this point. And I just think that title still
5 is just not helpful in communicating.

6 MR. BLACK: Why don't we just drop
7 "construction" out of there.

8 MS. BURCH: Well, we have already said that
9 there are going to be some subsets to the 3/4; right? So
10 we've left ourselves a little flexibility, or we've given
11 the Park Service -- we've advised the Park Service to use
12 flexibility. So I agree with Barbara that I think we could
13 drop that second part, because it's sort of implied in all
14 the other.

15 MS. TRIBE: Well, we have two issues out
16 here. One is about the name and the other is about whether
17 this is okay, regardless of what we call it. Let's try to
18 see if we can agree on the statement and then do the name;
19 okay?

20 MS. PAHL: I don't think any of us are going
21 to have a problem with that, except for Tony.

22 MR. JEWETT: As I read that statement, as I
23 interpret that statement, which I think works for me, if I'm
24 interpreting it correctly, is what we're basically saying is
25 that as a general approach, shared use is the approach we

1 think best suits the problem that's in front of us. At the
2 same time, we're not specifically endorsing the Shared
3 Use/Extended Construction integration that's before us.

4 MS. TRIBE: I didn't use the word "endorse"
5 up here on purpose. I used "prefer," and I used "approach"
6 instead of "alternative" because that's probably the biggest
7 bucket that will draw the most of you in. If we say things
8 like At this time, and with the information available to us,
9 the Committee would like the National Park Service to adopt
10 Alternative 3/4 combined, as is stated today, we won't have
11 any kind of agreement.

12 MS. PAHL: Tony, is this about that you -- to
13 support this, you want to see an absolute on the shuttle
14 system?

15 MR. JEWETT: No, I don't. No, this is all
16 about saying Okay, shared use makes a lot of sense. There's
17 four or five different ways we can do shared use. And we
18 should ferret those out and see how they fit together and
19 see -- in terms of cost and use -- and see what the public
20 has to say.

21 MS. PAHL: Here's what I'm concerned about.
22 It relates to the fact that we have so much information and
23 more will come out. What I don't want to do is create a
24 situation that makes -- limits the flexibility of ultimately
25 the company who's going to be hired to do that road, to do

1 what they need to do to get the work done.

2 So I think what we are putting forward is a
3 concept, without too much detail. Because at the end of the
4 day, they need the flexibility, when they have a given
5 problem up there, to address it with a road segment or
6 30-minute or whatever it takes to do it. And I'm afraid if
7 we put too much detail to this -- I mean, what we're
8 basically saying is the concept of we want access by the
9 public, we want reasonable access by the construction crew,
10 and we think this can be done at a reasonable cost to the
11 taxpayer in a reasonable length of time. So my concern is
12 if we get into too much detail, we're going to make it
13 harder for them to do their job and cost them more.

14 MR. JEWETT: I agree with you completely.

15 MS. TRIBE: What I hear you saying is It
16 works for me.

17 MR. JEWETT: Yeah.

18 MS. TRIBE: But that doesn't mean that we
19 would slip over the board. What that means is what Barbara
20 just said, and you said I agree a hundred percent.

21 That we believe that the best way to do business
22 here is that the public gets to use the road, but it has to
23 be balanced with the ability of the engineers and
24 flexibility of the engineers to do their job within the
25 contract they have, for a reasonable amount of money and

1 before any of us are dead.

2 MS. PAHL: There you go.

3 MR. DAKIN: Or before all of us are dead.

4 MS. TRIBE: Maybe that's better.

5 CHAIRMAN OGLE: A nice senior moment.

6 MS. TRIBE: Well, I reported to a job once
7 and I was told that we were going to finish the EIS in eight
8 months. And I did a good deal of the writing on the record
9 of decision ten years later. So, you know, you may not be
10 kidding. Remember, David?

11 MR. JACKSON: Yes, I know that.

12 MS. TRIBE: So we're okay?

13 Now, let's go to the name.

14 MR. DAKIN: I would like to not. I mean, we
15 did edit down the name to Shared Use/Extended Construction
16 Season. We deleted "where critical" which was a laudable
17 thing to do. But, to me, leaving the name the way it is is
18 not onerous, and it implies that those little jobs that do
19 require total road closure would be tacked on at the end of
20 the season or perhaps at the very beginning. I'm quite
21 skeptical about the use of the month of June, frankly, to
22 get much done up there. But I like it. I would not like to
23 drop the concept of the Extended Construction Season,
24 because I think that kind of pinpoints the total road
25 excavation projects that they will be done on the shoulders

1 of the season.

2 MS. TRIBE: Possibly you could clean it up a
3 little bit, although, Barbara, this adds more words. But a
4 Shared Use With an Extended Construction Season. "With an"
5 just sort of helps people understand what that means. So
6 what do you think?

7 Susie. Sorry; I had Anna Marie ahead of you. In
8 fact, Bill got away from you.

9 MS. MOE: My concern with just leaving it a
10 Shared Use is, right now, that the Alternative 3 was a
11 Comprehensive Shared Use. And if we're talking a
12 combination of 3/4 by just saying a Shared Use, that people
13 are not going to understand that it's a combination of 3/4.
14 They're going to think it's 3.

15 MS. BURCH: Well, first of all, the essence
16 of what shared use means is that we're going to allow the
17 visitor and the construction crews access to the road as
18 much -- both of them, as full as possible. So, to me, that
19 encompasses all of this concept. And I have to say, "With
20 Extended Construction Season," I don't want that to
21 inadvertently seem like that's every year. And I realize
22 it's laudable to take out "where critical." And yet, if we
23 say a shared use concept, that means yeah, we're going to be
24 kind of flexible about giving everybody access to the top,
25 to the sides, to the whole road. We say Shared Use With

1 Extended Construction Season, then you're starting to chop
2 down the flexibility of it. And this is not a deal breaker,
3 as far as I'm concerned, at all. But I think the more words
4 we put in here, at this point, the fussier it gets.

5 MS. TRIBE: Well, let's use the vote, since
6 this is not necessarily a deal breaker.

7 MR. O'QUINN: What have you got now?

8 MS. TRIBE: We have, "At this time, and with
9 the information available to us, the Committee prefers a
10 Shared Use/Extended Construction Season approach or
11 concept."

12 MR. JEWETT: What happened to that part about
13 people dying and all that stuff?

14 MS. TRIBE: Yeah, I forgot that. I'm going
15 to let Barney finish.

16 MR. O'QUINN: I think you need to put that
17 "With an" in there, because it gets back to what I think
18 Susie's saying, that it then might seem like if the
19 contractor's in there in the month of October, you're going
20 to let the general public in there in October. And the idea
21 is not -- the idea is the general public is going to be in
22 there the same season or schedule they're in now but giving
23 the contractor the shoulders to use.

24 MS. TRIBE: So this isn't an extended visitor
25 and construction season, it's only an extended construction

1 season.

2 MR. O'QUINN: Yeah.

3 MS. TRIBE: So Barney's suggesting adding a
4 Shared Use With an Extended Construction Season.

5 I've got David, and then I've got Linda and then
6 Barbara.

7 MR. JACKSON: I think we have to add a phrase
8 at the end, and we're missing some rich words. And the
9 phrase at the end, after "concept to the historic
10 preservation of the Going-to-the-Sun Road." And that's
11 really what we're trying to do.

12 MS. TRIBE: So I'm going to read it, because
13 I'm not with you yet. "At this time, and with the
14 information available to us, the Committee prefers a Shared
15 Use With an Extended Construction Season Approach to" --

16 MR. JACKSON: "To the historic preservation
17 of the Going-to-the-Sun Road."

18 MS. LEWIS: "In order to accomplish the
19 historic preservation of the Going-to-the-Sun Road."

20 MR. JACKSON: Or the concept of to the
21 historic preservation of the Going-to-the-sun Road. That
22 we're not just going out and paving it.

23 MR. DAKIN: Could I suggest, instead of the
24 word "preservation," you just say "historic rehabilitation
25 of the Sun Road."

1 MS. PAHL: Or just "the approach to the
2 rehabilitation of the Going-to-the-Sun Road." "Historic
3 preservation" is a noun, it's not a verb.

4 MR. JACKSON: I think "historic preservation"
5 are stronger words. We've listened to testimony about how
6 the rocks can be fit around the cement interior wall. We've
7 listened to --

8 MS. PAHL: There you go. There you go.

9 MR. JACKSON: -- testimony from the landscape
10 architect and the listing of it. We changed our language to
11 rehabilitation so you can follow all of that out of this
12 statement. And that's what we --

13 MS. TRIBE: Can everybody hear David? I
14 moved your word. Blah, blah, blah, blah, "the Committee
15 prefers a Shared Use With an Extended Construction Season
16 approach in order to" or in -- no.

17 MS. PAHL: To rehabilitate the historic
18 Going-to-the-Sun Road.

19 MS. TRIBE: -- "to rehabilitate the historic
20 Going-to-the-Sun Road."

21 MR. O'QUINN: That's good.

22 MS. TRIBE: Okay? I'll rewrite it in a
23 minute.

24 "At this time, and with the information available
25 to us, the Committee prefers a Shared Use With an Extended

1 Construction Season approach, in rehabilitating the historic
2 Going-to-the-Sun Road."

3 MS. PAHL: "Approach to the rehabilitation
4 of."

5 Now, I had people hanging around. Anybody else?
6 Barbara?

7 MS. PAHL: I'd like to suggest we don't have
8 to put our entire thought into one sentence. So what I'd
9 like to do, and I don't know however you want to do this, as
10 a group or a subcommittee or whatever, that we still go with
11 shared use. At some point, we've got to start talking about
12 how we're going to articulate to the public a concept that's
13 simple and they can grasp it. And a second sentence could
14 say some of the detail related to the extended construction
15 season, or we envision that blah, blah, blah.

16 MS. TRIBE: So something like blah, blah,
17 blah, "the Committee prefers a shared use approach. A
18 shared use approach includes an extended construction season
19 that allows for use on the shoulders and" blah, blah, blah.

20 MS. PAHL: Yes, yes.

21 MS. TRIBE: What do you think about that?
22 Barbara, would you be willing? And Susie, would you help?

23 MS. BURCH: Yes.

24 MS. TRIBE: Would you go out in the hall and
25 do something with this?

1 MS. PAHL: May we add maybe a third sentence?

2 MS. TRIBE: Can you do anything you want, if
3 you can do it in five minutes.

4 MR. JEWETT: I have a question for Barb,
5 because you've done a 180 on me, Barb, and I agreed with the
6 first 90. And the point you made five minutes ago was
7 that -- I absolutely share this -- that the statement,
8 really, is jumping off point for this Committee to begin to
9 communicate to the public how it's giving a message. And,
10 to me, you truncated -- and then you truncated it at Shared
11 Use. You said that's the way to do that. And I think
12 you're right. And now we're talking about doing something
13 else to it which complicates that message. And so I guess
14 my point is, are we all in agreement we want to?

15 MS. TRIBE: Why don't we let them give it a
16 shot and see what comes back.

17 MS. PAHL: Clarification. I'm happy to not
18 do this and to leave it at Shared Use. But for those who
19 seem to want to add the extended construction season
20 concept, then I'd prefer do that in a second sentence rather
21 than call it that and have it there. So if people are
22 comfortable with dumping that, which would be my preference,
23 then I wouldn't mind. But if they want to have it, my
24 suggestion would be to have it in the second sentence and
25 not the title.

1 The other point is, all the comments where people
2 rightly saw the combination of this, they referred to it as
3 the Shared Use approach. So the idea is you put the
4 sidewalks where the people walk. That's how they refer to
5 it. That seems to make sense to people. Why complicate it?

6 MR. JEWETT: My question was, do you want to
7 go out in the hall or do you want to find out what the
8 preference is?

9 MS. TRIBE: If the preference is 50/50 or
10 somewhere in that neighborhood, I'd like to at least see it
11 so we have that on paper to see what we're talking about.

12 Randy.

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I was going to say I don't
14 care whether it's a shared use and you have the extended
15 construction season in a separate sentence, but I think it
16 needs to be there somehow. Because Shared Use is the name
17 of number 3 only. And I think what we expressed preference
18 on is the combined, and that 4 is the extended
19 rehabilitation season and that's a little different concept.
20 So I think if we either call it Shared Use and put extended
21 season in a separate sentence or have the whole thing there,
22 the public will probably call it shared use anyway. I think
23 that will work out fine. But I don't think we can just drop
24 the Extended Construction Season, because then we leave
25 confusion for the public to say Well, gee, 3 is what they're

1 saying the preference is for, and I don't think that's what
2 has been expressed as a preference, is for 3 also.

3 MR. TRIBE: So that also could be confusing
4 to the public.

5 All I'm trying to do is use a little conflict
6 management tool. And that is when you have people in
7 disagreement, not over the basic premise but over words and
8 how it's put together, then the tool to use is throw up the
9 alternatives and let's look at them together. I'm just
10 asking if the two of you would be willing to do that as soon
11 as we hear Joe's comment.

12 MR. KRACUM: One thought with regards to the
13 words "extended rehabilitation season." That may require
14 some additional explanation. And I'll just throw it out
15 there. You might want to say that the road will be open
16 from this date to this date. That's essentially what it is.

17 MS. TRIBE: I think we'll start losing people
18 then, I mean, if we start tying down some of those things.
19 The agreement we had was in the concept. And that's my
20 biggest worry about when these two go out in the hall is
21 that it's going to get real specific. Because I know, for
22 sure, I'm going to lose Tony again. Or excuse me for
23 talking about you. So I just would --

24 MR. JEWETT: Talk about me all you want.

25 MS. TRIBE: At least I do it while you're

1 here.

2 So if the two of you wouldn't mind very quickly
3 running out where you can write up a statement, come in, put
4 it on the flip chart and then let's see what to do with it.

5 MR. O'QUINN: Can I say one thing before we
6 do that because it has to do with this.

7 This is the alternatives as we've evaluated it.
8 And it's like Randy said, we took two and combined them.
9 When the Park Service gets around to doing the environmental
10 document, they can number them A through Z or 1 through 20
11 and call them whatever they want to. These names can go
12 away. But for the meaning of what we're doing, if we take
13 that extended season away from it, it's confusing what we've
14 got as back-up data for the analysis.

15 MS. TRIBE: You see, there's a perfect answer
16 here. It's not like we have this argument about whether we
17 can only use Shared Use or only use the whole thing. We
18 have a perfect solution. And that is you allow Shared Use
19 to stand alone and then you clarify it with a statement.
20 And it's a win/win for both sides, if we can see the
21 statement. So I'm going to sort of declare no more
22 statements about it until these two women go out there and
23 do that. And now you only have three minutes.

24 MS. PAHL: Well, that may just not be
25 sufficient.

1 (Whereupon Ms. Pahl and Ms. Burch exit the
2 Committee room to draft language. At this time the rest of
3 the Committee members are asked and instructed to read,
4 approve and then sign the forwarding document to the
5 National Park Service. They must sign 30 original documents
6 for various agencies and places of record, which they do.)

7 (Proceedings in recess from 3:05 p.m. to
8 3:15 p.m.)

9 MS. TRIBE: This is the kind of process that
10 in some ways is hard to bring to closure. Because we would
11 like to dot every I and cross every T and see all of that
12 before we sign our name. We're not going to be able to
13 reproduce the document today and have everybody have a copy
14 of it, because it's just not possible. So I guess what
15 we're asking is that since you signed the sheet, we got
16 you -- no.

17 That all the comments that have been made up until
18 lunch, Mary and Dayna got into the computer and changed the
19 document. And we've sort of double checked and triple
20 checked around to try to make sure that we've got it right.

21 Based on the fact that they did an admirable job
22 in turning it into an actual document, I would like to
23 suggest that we look at these in terms of cost, we look at
24 them in terms of redundancy, and then we ask the Park
25 Service if they would be willing to do sort of the

1 wordsmithing, versus this group wordsmithing every one of
2 them.

3 So where are you? Anybody have an objection to
4 that? We'll talk about redundancy, we'll talk about cost,
5 we'll do what we need, but the final statement, we'll sort
6 of ask them if they would do it.

7 Anna Marie?

8 MS. MOE: Would they then send it out to us
9 like they did the draft document in case anybody had any --

10 MS. TRIBE: No, they wouldn't.

11 MS. MOE: -- questions?

12 MS. ANSOTEGUI: We would run it by the
13 chairman.

14 MS. LEWIS: We send it out to each one of you
15 again as another draft, and you comment, and we have to go
16 back out and ask everyone if they like your comment. So it
17 becomes a never-ending process in terms -- we either do it
18 here or you give us the license to do it.

19 MS. TRIBE: It was not my -- I didn't find
20 that they tried to twist anything. And I mean, I think, in
21 fact, I heard that they were scared to death to even move an
22 "and" around or an "or" because they were so afraid of the
23 Committee thinking they were trying to influence it one way
24 or another. But I'm not saying just hand it to them cold.
25 You know, we'll do a little work here. But based on the

1 wordsmithing that this group really likes to do, it might
2 take us quite a while to wordsmith.

3 MS. PAHL: I don't think what we've been
4 trying to do is wordsmith. I think what we've been trying
5 to do is to get some clarification on what we're really
6 saying about these things. And I don't think, again,
7 anything we have to get before us is going to be too tough.
8 Because I think there's already a lot of agreement. So I'd
9 say let's just go through it. I don't think you're going to
10 find --

11 MS. TRIBE: Let's look at this one first.
12 This is the rewrite that Susie and Barbara did. And it
13 says -- I just want Tony to buy into this. "At this time,
14 and with the information available to us, the Committee
15 prefers a Shared Use approach to rehabilitate historic
16 Going-to-the-Sun Road. A Shared Use approach may employ an
17 extended construction season to accomplish critical work.
18 We believe this approach provides visitor and construction
19 access to Going-to-the-Sun Road at a reasonable cost to the
20 public."

21 MR. O'QUINN: Now, question. So far as
22 what's in the report itself, the four alternatives that are
23 still in there, 3/4 is still Shared Use with Construction.

24 MS. TRIBE: Yeah. That whole thing goes
25 forward.

1 MR. O'QUINN: That's fine.

2 MS. TRIBE: So it says chapter three, final
3 advice. These comments are in there, and the whole other
4 part of what you agreed on is in there.

5 MR. O'QUINN: An advantage of this is it gets
6 back to what Tony was saying, is this doesn't tie us to
7 exactly Alternative 3/4. It's a concept.

8 MS. TRIBE: That's right. But it certainly
9 does support -- I love the word "principle" in there because
10 it provides a guidance.

11 Bill.

12 MR. DAKIN: I'd like to suggest two
13 adjectives.

14 MS. PAHL: Now this is totally wordsmithing.

15 MS. TRIBE: Green and red?

16 MR. DAKIN: Acceptable visitor --

17 MS. TRIBE: "We believe this approach
18 provides" --

19 MR. DAKIN: "Acceptable visitor enjoyment and
20 effective construction access."

21 MS. BURCH: I don't like that.

22 MR. DAKIN: Sorry. And the reason for that
23 is, I think that we're trying to state that we think that in
24 this approach lies the solution to combining visitor use and
25 getting the work done.

1 MS. TRIBE: Bill, would you be able to use
2 the word "use" instead of enjoyment? Enjoyment's got a
3 little more value hanging on it.

4 MR. DAKIN: Yeah; "acceptable visitor use and
5 effective construction access."

6 Any problem? Doesn't change it. "Acceptable"
7 goes to the business of balancing, and "effective" goes to
8 the business of the engineers being able to get their job
9 done.

10 Okay; then let's walk through these.

11 FROM THE FLOOR: Did you want to get Tony's
12 buy in?

13 MS. TRIBE: You came back in.

14 MR. JEWETT: What do I need --

15 MR. O'QUINN: Just say okay.

16 MR. JEWETT: It looks absolutely perfect.

17 MS. TRIBE: So you two should say thank you
18 to him.

19 MS. PAHL: No, he could say thank you to us.

20 MS. TRIBE: Bambi's asked me to read it one
21 more time. "At this time, and with the information
22 available to us" --

23 MS. PAHL: Virginia, before you finish, for
24 Bambi's sake, I think we forgot a little verb in there.
25 "The shared use approach to rehabilitate the historic," just

1 as you read it for her benefit. Before historic goes "the."
2 "The historic," right above.

3 MS. TRIBE: I thought you did it
4 intentionally without the "the."

5 MS. BURCH: I did do it intentionally.

6 MS. TRIBE: "At this time, and with the
7 information available to us, the Committee prefers a Shared
8 Use approach to rehabilitate the historic Going-to-the-Sun
9 Road. A Shared Use approach may employ an extended
10 construction season to accomplish critical work. We believe
11 this approach provides acceptable visitor use and effective
12 construction access to the Going-to-the-Sun Road at a
13 reasonable cost to the public." And this becomes the
14 guiding principle.

15 MS. PAHL: That becomes why we picked it.

16 MS. TRIBE: That's right. And a guiding
17 principle helps define the decision space. So it's within
18 this that we would like the Park Service to analyze how they
19 do the job. Doesn't mean they won't look at other
20 alternatives, but that's what we're saying to the Park
21 Service.

22 I'm going to hide this one now, so we can't talk
23 about it anymore. Thank you to the two of you.

24 So over here we have some redundancy. So this
25 group is saying that in the initial comments about the

1 recommendations, that this Committee is saying that the road
2 should be rehabilitated because it's in need of repair and
3 it's not past repair; okay?

4 They are encouraging the National Park Service to
5 actively work with the public, commercial, private,
6 nonprofit, as well as tribal governments and organizations
7 to create proactive public information and a proactive
8 public information and marketing program to offset the
9 negative effects of road rehabilitation.

10 And over here -- so I'm going to call this 2. And
11 over here we have a 2 also, which is -- it has to do with PR
12 but it's the actual retention -- it's a strategy, rather
13 than advice. And then over here we have the same thing,
14 request from Congress a line-item that would pay for public
15 involvement or pay for it within the NEPA process. So
16 that's sort of the same thing all the way across? Okay.

17 So if we were talking about a cost, this one's
18 probably priciest of the strategies, but you're suggesting
19 this at least be considered.

20 MR. O'QUINN: Seems to me, and I think the
21 first is best and this is.

22 MS. TRIBE: Is that what you said the first
23 report was best, and that's the one you did?

24 MR. O'QUINN: Right. I think that one gives
25 them guidance as to what the Committee would like for them

1 to consider doing. The other two are rather specific in how
2 to do it.

3 MS. TRIBE: So there might be a way, though,
4 to -- through the sentences be able to say, for example, a
5 public relations firm or line-item budget or whatever, but
6 you're saying, Barney, this is actually the advice.

7 MR. O'QUINN: Yeah. And it wasn't mine, it
8 was Suzann's.

9 MS. TRIBE: So can we kind of lump these?
10 Would you be okay?

11 MS. PAHL: Yeah.

12 MS. TRIBE: Encourage the National Park
13 Service to use a stake-holder or steering committee in this
14 their continuing public process. We'll call this 3. Here's
15 a 3. The National Park Service appoint a steering
16 committee. And number 4 is a steering committee or some
17 ongoing --

18 MS. LEWIS: Write 3 there, or you're going to
19 lose it.

20 MS. TRIBE: Thank you.

21 MS. TRIBE: Now, this is a 1. We finished
22 this group; okay?

23 MS. PAHL: Can I add something to their 1?

24 MS. TRIBE: Yes.

25 MS. PAHL: Can we add as a reason

1 again -- what I like about number 1 is stating up front that
2 our sincere desire can we add because of its national
3 significance and besides it's just some old road that needs
4 repair, it happens to be a nationally significant old road.

5 MS. TRIBE: And that has to do with national
6 public dollars paying for it.

7 MS. PAHL: You bet you. And it's going to be
8 a lot of public dollars.

9 MS. TRIBE: So I'm going to turn this one
10 over. This one's done.

11 Now, this group is suggesting that we say up front
12 that it would be preferable in the language that's used that
13 the public understand that this Committee did not, in any
14 way, suggest that road closure -- long-term closure of the
15 road would be acceptable; is that right? Okay.

16 MR. BAKER: As suggested in Alternative 5.

17 MS. TRIBE: I think 5 only closes half of it.

18 MR. JEWETT: That was different, yeah.

19 MR. O'QUINN: Isn't this more part of the
20 analysis of the alternatives?

21 MS. TRIBE: Well, I think what this is is the
22 Committee would like the public to know that they didn't
23 ever -- the thing that Randy talked about this morning from
24 the local chamber about you've got to get over to that
25 meeting because they're going to close the road? I think

1 people just -- you just want the public to know that you
2 didn't ever say close the road.

3 MR. JEWETT: That whole point had to do with
4 spin and public relations and nothing to do with terminology
5 within the document.

6 MS. PAHL: Right.

7 MS. TRIBE: That's right.

8 MS. PAHL: Which clearly we haven't done a
9 good job of, I guess.

10 MS. TRIBE: Or there's old baggage laying
11 around from the past when people talked about closing the
12 road.

13 MR. BAKER: Is this not going to be
14 confusing, then, of this reading this point and then going
15 into the alternative and reading Alternative 5, Well, geez,
16 they're saying not to close the road here but they're giving
17 us this Alternative 5. What's going on here?

18 MS. STEWART: I think our point was just that
19 the Park Service needs to communicate to the public that the
20 Advisory Committee recommends no total road closure and to
21 come up -- and that's why we have our condition, come up
22 with a language that quells the fears of -- it's more about
23 addressing the fear than anything else, the fear and the
24 rumor.

25 MS. TRIBE: So you had the word "total" here,

1 I just didn't see it. So it's very clear that the Committee
2 did not recommend total road closure in any alternative.

3 MS. STEWART: In any sense.

4 MS. TRIBE: And even in 5, Logan Pass is
5 always open.

6 MR. O'QUINN: We've got to be careful
7 because, again, to the average person, if he cannot go from
8 one end to the other and keep on getting as far as he's
9 concerned, it may be closed.

10 MS. TRIBE: Well, then, we're looking at
11 every alternative.

12 MR. O'QUINN: That's why I'm a little
13 frightened of this language, because there are going to be
14 times when you cannot go from end to the other.

15 MS. STEWART: I think that's why we have the
16 clarification that someone needs to have temporary road
17 suspension. That someone needs to come up with language
18 that says, you know, we're going to have a traffic stoppage
19 or traffic suspension from 4:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. Wednesday.
20 Something that doesn't say the road will be closed. And
21 we've said that over and over everywhere.

22 MS. LEWIS: Maybe, if I could, refer the
23 Committee to page 16 of their report, so that you can look
24 at what you've had to say about Alternative 5 where you did
25 say that the name needs to be accelerated completion through

1 isolated road segment suspensions. It says that this
2 alternative has to assure continued access to Logan Pass.
3 You did a great deal of work in September in trying to get
4 just at this, making sure that number 5 is not interpreted
5 as any sort of road closure. But it does allow for segment
6 suspensions. And remember we talked a lot in September
7 about the words? We were trying to hard to find a new set
8 of words. So you've done -- if you review your work on page
9 16, I think that will help you make a determination of what
10 you want to do with this. Because as it stands right now,
11 and I think this is really important before we leave here
12 today, from all the listening I've done today and the notes
13 that I see were taken, pages 16 and 17 stand in this
14 document as part of your final recommendations.

15 MR. BAKER: Yeah. And I thought we were
16 going to come back and talk about it, but I guess it wasn't
17 brought up on these new ideas so we're not.

18 MS. TRIBE: So, Brian, you were talking about
19 dismissing 5 as an alternative.

20 MR. BAKER: No. I just wanted to go back and
21 talk about it because of these issues.

22 MS. LEWIS: Well, you did do something with
23 number 5 this morning. Before we broke for lunch, you wrote
24 a statement when you captured -- remember we went all the
25 way through the document and Gini said she wanted to give

1 everybody a chance to capture anything that we came back to?
2 There's a written statement that says it's inadequate, and
3 that's on one of your earlier flip charts that was done this
4 morning.

5 MR. O'QUINN: That was 2.

6 MS. TRIBE: We did not dismiss 5. And Brian
7 and I have sort of had this ongoing conversation about it.
8 I thought in the small groups that if somebody wanted to
9 dismiss it, it would have come up. And that was the reason
10 we did this last catch for everybody's comments. Just as
11 this group over here said all four of these need to go
12 forward in the analysis.

13 So I guess I'd like to see if we could stick with
14 the business here of trying to decide whether you want to
15 make a statement sort of disclaiming total road closure or
16 not, or if you want to say something -- if you stand with
17 this that says Shared Use which sort of points out how you
18 feel about -- I mean, this is the opposite of having to
19 say -- this is the other kind of strategy. Instead of
20 saying no road closures, you've made a statement here about
21 what you do want to do.

22 MS. PAHL: Again, I think it's that we need
23 to articulate, in more than three words, what that means,
24 instead of saying no road closure, that what we really mean
25 is what Fred's going to say right now.

1 MR. BABB: The Committee spent a lot of time
2 about the half-full glass and half-empty glass, why not turn
3 it around and being positive and talk about the road being
4 open rather than the road being closed?

5 MS. PAHL: But I think what we need is a
6 sentence as opposed to words that will be misleading. Maybe
7 we can tack it onto what we said somewhere else in our
8 guidance. But it is the Committee's expectation that the
9 road will be open during the construction season
10 unless -- if you want to put in some sort of caveat the work
11 that requires segments with the exception of situations that
12 require the closure of small segments of the road, something
13 to that effect.

14 MR. O'QUINN: Isn't that what you already
15 went out and wrote down?

16 MS. TRIBE: That was my point a minute ago.

17 MS. STEWART: I think the intent of our
18 comment is that we feel strongly that we want to advise the
19 Park system that somehow the public fears need to be allayed
20 in regard to road closure, to quell the public fears. I
21 think that was the intent of the whole statement. Am I
22 wrong on that?

23 MR. O'QUINN: The problem with doing
24 that -- and they're going to come right back in the
25 environmental document -- they're going to almost have to

1 look at some alternatives that are going to have, quote,
2 unquote, "road closure" to some extent in them.

3 MS. PAHL: That's fine. But this is what the
4 Committee thinks.

5 MR. O'QUINN: And that's what they're going
6 to be hammered, big time, because they're going to say the
7 Committee's already told you not to do that. We thought we
8 were past that yada, yada, yada.

9 MS. STEWART: So we're not saying no road
10 closure. We're saying come up with language. Suzann
11 brought up the fact that we struggled with it before, we
12 struggled with it all along that we need to have some
13 language that addresses the public fears.

14 MS. TRIBE: Well, here's a stab, see where
15 you go with it. It's the Committee's recommendation that
16 the road be open during construction, acknowledging that
17 there will be stoppages and segment suspensions when needed
18 by the engineers.

19 MS. PAHL: I like that.

20 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Traffic stoppages?

21 MS. TRIBE: Yeah. Hikers will be stopped.

22 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Horses will be stopped.

23 MR. O'QUINN: Hopefully, the bears will stop.

24 MR. BLACK: That runs us right back into 5
25 again.

1 MR. BAKER: Exactly.

2 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think we've got a real land
3 mine here, leaving 5 in there. Because it opens up the door
4 for closures.

5 MS. PAHL: But you've got segment suspensions
6 in 4.

7 MS. BURCH: But we've come out with a clear
8 support.

9 MS. TRIBE: Roscoe, are you thinking that
10 there won't be any time that a member of the public won't be
11 stopped for a part of the road construction?

12 MR. BLACK: No. But on the other hand, I'm
13 not going to leave it open to segment stoppages that can be
14 interpreted as running Sunday through Thursday every day
15 through the season.

16 MR. BAKER: Absolutely.

17 MS. TRIBE: So I added a word here, see if it
18 helps at all. It's the Committee's recommendation that the
19 road be open during construction. The Committee
20 acknowledges that there will be limited traffic stoppages
21 and segment suspensions in order to get the construction job
22 accomplished.

23 MS. PAHL: I think he wants to say in the
24 shoulder season.

25 MR. BLACK: Not necessarily. Because when we

1 talked about the combination of 3/4, one of the things that
2 we don't have in there is go ahead and close it every night
3 except for the weekends. That was an option, that that may
4 come up.

5 MS. TRIBE: So what -- you would rather we
6 didn't have this at all.

7 MR. BLACK: Yeah.

8 MS. TRIBE: That we just stick with what
9 we've got over here. Remember this statement? "At this
10 time and with this we have a shared approach. And the
11 shared approach implies an extended construction season to
12 accomplish critical work. But within this, there's probably
13 going to be -- I would not expect to drive up there and not
14 be stopped.

15 MR. BLACK: But then, could we go to number 5
16 and put something in number 5 that says that the Committee
17 is not pushing this particular one forward?

18 MS. TRIBE: And that goes back to Brian's
19 comment earlier.

20 So what Brian and Roscoe are asking is that you
21 have a similar statement that you had for the others. Which
22 is, While this alternative, blah, blah, blah, whatever, the
23 Committee does not prefer it.

24 MR. BLACK: Right. And I think it was done
25 on number 2.

1 MR. O'QUINN: Did it on 1 and 2 for different
2 reasons though.

3 MR. BLACK: Go back a page on the bottom of
4 theirs. They went through. What did they say?

5 MS. TRIBE: They recommend that all four
6 alternatives go forward in the EIS. But they have some
7 comments about that.

8 MR. BLACK: Right.

9 MS. TRIBE: Number 1 doesn't meet the purpose
10 and need; number 2 is inadequate for the road needs; number
11 3 is based on public input that's unacceptable. It's
12 questionable as a practical construction method. That's
13 when Tony said we need to look at all the public comments,
14 including that public comment that urged us to do it in a
15 hurry. Then we had the comment about 5, as it's written,
16 people probably misunderstood that it would be in a hurry.

17 MR. BAKER: Well, it endorses segmented road
18 closures, number 5 does.

19 MS. TRIBE: Remember why we did a preferred.
20 We did a preferred so that the members of the public out
21 there would know which one you liked best. That's why we
22 did it. If you wipe everything else off the table, then
23 what you're saying to the Park Service is We only would move
24 one alternative into the EIS.

25 CHAIRMAN OGLE: No, no, no. We're back

1 talking about what we did first thing this morning. We're
2 not advising on the EIS.

3 MS. TRIBE: So, Brian, you're not saying that
4 we bag it. You would agree with this, of moving it forward,
5 Roscoe. You would simply say Alternative 5 is not the
6 preference of the Committee.

7 MR. BLACK: Is not our preferred alternative.

8 MR. O'QUINN: You could give reasons why. We
9 have on the other two.

10 MS. TRIBE: Well, what if we just use the
11 language here? We said 5, as written, is questionable as a
12 practical construction method.

13 MR. DAKIN: Well, it seems to me that we've
14 had discussion that we needed to do a kind of -- perhaps
15 it's a token inclusion of 5, because it was such a recurring
16 theme in public comment. And that that's part of our
17 honorable purpose is to enwrap that public comment.

18 I think the more you dwell on it, the more you
19 kind of work against yourself. By articulating a preferred
20 alternative, which we have done with Shared Use, there's no
21 need to, in any way, try to tell that segment of the public,
22 even though we know they thought they were talking about a
23 two- or three-year closure, that we disregard their
24 comments. The process needs to include that as an
25 alternative so that it's shown to be not workable.

1 MS. TRIBE: So do we have agreement that 5
2 would go ahead as one of the alternatives that we're putting
3 forward, like this group says? Do we have agreement on
4 that?

5 MR. BAKER: Like what group said?

6 MS. TRIBE: This group said 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5
7 are alternatives that would go forward, even though we want
8 to say, quietly in front of Randy, but we would say these go
9 forward in the EIS.

10 MR. BAKER: Not as it's written. I think
11 it's working against our preferred alternative. Because
12 you're looking now -- in one sense, you're saying what our
13 preferred alternative was and why, but then when the public
14 looks at the second alternative that we have endorsed, which
15 is what it's sounding like, it says right in there that the
16 road's going to be closed during the week.

17 MS. BURCH: If we take that out, I think we
18 are being extremely tyrannical. I am very happy that this
19 Committee has come forward with a preferred alternative. I
20 think that was critical for us to do that. But the only
21 caveat that I would add to that is that if we're going to
22 put on those others, 1, 2, these are not our
23 preferred -- you know, that we are not recommending this, I
24 forget what the language is we used, then I think we should
25 employ -- we could possibly employ, or for consistency

1 should employ that language for 5.

2 MR. BAKER: Exactly. That's what I'm saying.

3 MS. BURCH: Or else we could take them off
4 for all of them. Because I don't see any reason why we have
5 to keep beating a dead horse when we said This is what we're
6 going for.

7 MS. TRIBE: You have two choices. You can
8 either walk in and say bump, bump, bump, bump, or you can
9 say this one. It's saying that we're being redundant by
10 saying we have a preferred and we don't prefer those. So
11 what Susie is suggesting is, if you're going to have in your
12 recommendations the statement about a preferred approach,
13 then you remove the statements about the others, because
14 obviously this is the one that you prefer as an approach.
15 It has nothing to do with what goes forward in the EIS.

16 MR. O'QUINN: Well, the only thing there on
17 the way we've written it, we have not said why we prefer it.
18 We have said why we do not prefer 1 and 2. We could say the
19 same thing about 5.

20 MS. TRIBE: You did say why you preferred it.

21 MS. KREMENIK: And the only merit to doing
22 all the crosses and circles is that on the cross on 5, we're
23 going to be saying why we don't like that, to be consistent
24 with 1 and 2.

25 MS. TRIBE: I'm sorry; you said I think what

1 we should do -- I didn't hear what you said.

2 MR. O'QUINN: Is to say why we do not prefer
3 5 if we're going to say why we do not prefer 1 and 2.

4 MS. TRIBE: I think that the statement on 1
5 and 2 is a really limited statement. I don't think you've
6 gone into a whole lot of analysis about why, other than
7 something like these few words up here.

8 MS. LEWIS: Again, listening, trying real
9 hard to listen to you as a Committee and in trying to shape
10 the final product, I guess the only thing I would hope that
11 you wouldn't lose sight of is the culmination of your work
12 is incredible at this point today. And it bears witness to
13 how you get to today and what -- and maybe I'm trying to
14 borrow a little bit from Barb. What I see is a need for you
15 to try to sum up, in a paragraph, what has been two years of
16 work on your part. An extensive amount of writing on the
17 part of a contractor and the National Park Service and all
18 of you who edited and made suggestions. That it just -- it
19 would concern me that if at some point the final document
20 does not trace these steps that you have gone.

21 Sitting here trying to listen to you, what I have
22 heard is that all of these alternatives are part of the
23 process you've been involved with. And you've had something
24 to say about each one of them. You have a lot to say about
25 your preferred action of combining 3 and 4. That's where

1 you get most excited, that's where you feel the spirit and
2 the intent of your work best lies. But to dismiss, to X out
3 1, 2 and 5 and what you did about 4, I think, just doesn't
4 fully represent the totality of your work. And the public
5 may -- a lot of people in the public may say Yea, that's
6 great, that's what we were hoping for, and a whole other set
7 of the public might say Well what else did you consider? To
8 your credibility as a committee, Well, what else did you
9 think about? And as the document stands now, where you have
10 something to say about each one of these alternatives, it
11 would answer that for the public. And it says Yeah, here
12 are the other four things that we looked at, and here's what
13 we had to say about them.

14 So I mean, that's the only thing I would encourage
15 you to think about, is the totality of your work is very,
16 very important, in my opinion, to have the public perceive
17 the work that you've done rather than just the sum total of
18 it.

19 MR. BAKER: Good point. I think it should be
20 left in, but I also think, given with what the 3/4 approach,
21 which we've really nicely articulated and looks good
22 encompasses a lot of what we're trying to do in number 5.
23 And if we put, as we did in 1 and 2 something that says, you
24 know, Alternative 5 -- alternative was examined and we
25 could -- you may not put dismissed by the Committee because

1 we feel the Committee felt the concepts of this alternative
2 was adequately covered in options 3/4.

3 MS. PAHL: If I could look in my crystal ball
4 for a minute, I think what may happen is -- and Joe, you can
5 correct me if I'm wrong, but it seems to me like you guys
6 are really trying to respond to that first meeting we had
7 two years ago in March with don't give us anything that has
8 road closure. And I bet you you guys are going to dismiss
9 Alternative 5 as potentially not doable. And the EIS may
10 have to actually have a proposal which is close the road,
11 totally, from A to Z, do it in three years or two years and
12 what's that going to cost. And 5 is just going to go away.
13 That's just a guess. So I don't think we need to worry too
14 much about what we do with it. Because whether we say we
15 don't like it or we don't say anything about it, I'm not
16 sure how critical it is to have that this process goes
17 forward.

18 MR. BAKER: And long as the public doesn't
19 get confused. Because they're looking at 1 and 2 and
20 they're seeing we dismissed it because of blah, blah, blah.
21 3 and 4 we wholeheartedly endorsed as an option -- as a
22 priority option, and 5 is still in there and we still
23 support it. Because that's what we're saying.

24 MR. O'QUINN: We didn't dismiss 1 and 2. We
25 said we didn't prefer it. They're not dismissed.

1 MR. BAKER: I know, but I don't have written
2 down exactly what Randy's change was, but it did say
3 dismissed.

4 MR. O'QUINN: He said it was inadequate.

5 MS. BURCH: On page 11 it says dismissed.

6 CHAIRMAN OGLE: The second one just said it
7 was found to be inadequate.

8 MR. DAKIN: We know there's going to be a
9 No-Action Alternative.

10 MS. TRIBE: I want to bring you back, again,
11 to why we're here. We have gone past the Charter, or
12 extrapolated from the Charter to get to a preference --
13 stating a preference. But before that, the reason that the
14 Secretary of Interior brought you together was "The purpose
15 of the Committee is to advise in the development of
16 alternatives." And so what you are saying is we've got this
17 approach over here and this shared use business, we think
18 that's a recognizable approach. We're not going to get
19 involved in the No-Action, you guys are better to do that.
20 We really don't think it's a good idea to do Repairs as
21 Needed, but we have these other alternatives out there. Of
22 those, we have this preference, even though you didn't ask
23 us for a preference. These alternatives will then be
24 analyzed.

25 I think what we keep losing track of is that this

1 is not a group that's supposed to say You guys do this one
2 thing and don't confuse the public. Because what you said
3 earlier today, Suzann, is the richness of the work here has
4 more to do with the range of alternatives that you've
5 developed than it does your preference. They're happy to
6 know your preference, but what they really needed from you
7 was sort of this idea of decision space. How big was it?
8 What should they analyze within that decision space? And so
9 I think we're sort of tied up, right now, with the business
10 of do we need to draw a red X through every one but the one
11 we care for, or can we stand on the statement about our
12 preference and go forward.

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I'd like to suggest, maybe to
14 get this behind us, some language on page 16 of this
15 document, at the end of the second sentence that might read
16 to this effect. This alternative -- end of the -- down in
17 the -- at the end of the second sentence in the first bullet
18 after rename alternative. Add the language to this effect,
19 "This alternative was examined by the Committee but is not
20 preferred."

21 MS. TRIBE: Fair enough.

22 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think that would --

23 MS. PAHL: Sure.

24 MS. TRIBE: It just restates the preference.

25 MR. O'QUINN: Do you not want to say why,

1 Randy? Do you not want to say why? You say it's not
2 preferred.

3 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I don't know that we have to.
4 I think that's good enough, without getting into reasons.
5 What I think it does, in my mind at least, is erases the
6 concern that Brian and Roscoe are addressing, I think, is
7 that the public might somehow consider this to be some
8 Committee support for closure. And I think that is the land
9 mine that this process has been fighting against ever since
10 the highway administration suggested this several years ago
11 and that wound up having this Committee. I think that this
12 will take out that.

13 MS. TRIBE: So would you say it one more
14 time, Randy, and see if that flies and make sure Mary and
15 Dayna have it in there.

16 CHAIRMAN OGLE: "This alternative was
17 examined by the Committee but is not preferred."

18 MS. TRIBE: That's okay? Brian, you in?

19 MR. BAKER: (Nods head.)

20 MS. TRIBE: Roscoe?

21 MR. BLACK: Okay.

22 MS. TRIBE: So when the Park Service prefers
23 it -- you know, this is sort of a crass thing to say, but it
24 also kind of lets you off the hook with your own
25 constituents, and that's part of this. Is that people are

1 banking on your heads about Wait a minute, how come?
2 Because they don't have understanding of the whole process.
3 And they can't believe you came in here and you let an
4 alternative go forward with the C word in it. So, Randy,
5 thanks for your wording.

6 MR. O'QUINN: And I would suggest, just for
7 clarity, what I would add to that is because we deem it
8 publicly unacceptable. Because otherwise, that's the way we
9 do it; we close your road and we build it.

10 MS. PAHL: That's a different alternative.
11 That's not 5.

12 MS. TRIBE: All right. So we have taken care
13 of this. We came up with language, Joni. Was he in your
14 group, originally?

15 MS. STEWART: Randy?

16 MS. TRIBE: Yeah.

17 MS. STEWART: Yeah.

18 MS. TRIBE: That's what I thought.

19 MR. JEWETT: I wouldn't cross that out. What
20 we came up with was language to deal with stuff inside the
21 alternatives. What that bullet was all about was to
22 urge -- was advice to the National Park Service to urge them
23 to look for terminology that dealt with this public
24 relations problem. That's all that was. And I still think
25 we sort of keep the creative juices working on that.

1 MS. BURCH: I would suggest detour in
2 Paradise.

3 MS. TRIBE: Now, that's nice. Detour in
4 Paradise with grizzly bear cookies.

5 MS. BURCH: That's just a 180-mile detour.

6 MS. TRIBE: So this one was sort of a just be
7 sure we're clarifying and that we're not being stupid in how
8 we say things so that we cause misperception. And we've
9 sort of cleaned it up in 5, but we might also -- we might
10 also want to say something here about this business -- well,
11 that does clean up 5. That's what you're talking about,
12 Tony, so that takes care of it.

13 MR. JEWETT: Well, inadvertently it did. We
14 weren't dealing with 5.

15 MS. TRIBE: So this becomes the new 4,
16 revisit the socioeconomic data, and that's the stuff that
17 David was talking about earlier today. Making sure we've
18 got the right -- or that we're real clear about the economic
19 data, the discussion between Jean and David; okay?

20 Revisit, the underlying assumptions that have to
21 do -- that lead to the estimates on costs and duration.

22 MS. PAHL: Can I ask what your concern is?
23 That's the first time I've seen that raised, and I don't
24 know what we talked about last time. So what is the concern
25 more? Is it because you think the socioeconomic data has

1 some problems so it affects the other? What is that about?

2 MR. BLACK: That's similar.

3 MS. TRIBE: So we already have it in the
4 other list.

5 MS. PAHL: So that has to do with the weather
6 delays that you were talking about earlier?

7 MR. BLACK: Yeah, just basically. And I
8 didn't bring this one up.

9 MS. LEWIS: Can I make a suggestion? I'm
10 going to make a suggestion, then, based on my remark. The
11 word "revisit" implies that we have an opportunity to redo
12 the final documents, and we do not have that opportunity.
13 They are final studies. So what I might ask is that you
14 look at a word that says ensure that the socioeconomic data
15 is accurate. Ensure that the cost estimates and
16 duration -- cost and duration are accurate.

17 MS. TRIBE: And I put them together.

18 MS. LEWIS: Because there is no opportunity
19 to revisit studies here that were actually finalized late
20 this summer. So, again, the advice is just make sure your
21 socioeconomic data is accurate. We know what Dave's
22 concerns are. And make sure that that duration and cost
23 comparison is also accurate.

24 MS. TRIBE: And that was particularly between
25 3 and 4, Roscoe, you were talking about.

1 MR. BLACK: Initially, this morning, yes.

2 MS. TRIBE: And this is probably as good a
3 time, Fred, as any to tell people that Joe had those new
4 numbers this morning. That when this is finalized, those
5 new cost numbers will be in there and not the ones that are
6 in there now.

7 MS. PAHL: The 4 percent as opposed to the 3
8 percent.

9 MS. TRIBE: Yeah. And then number 5,
10 re-emphasis on the need for maintenance. We've got it in
11 most of the alternatives, we've got it in the common
12 elements, we've got it in the list of advice. We've got it.

13 MS. LEWIS: To be consistent with your
14 wording, would you say ensure that -- again, I can't read
15 what it says.

16 MS. TRIBE: I don't know why.

17 MS. PAHL: This is just stressing something
18 that's already in there, Suzann. It's just meant to say
19 this is something that's a critical need; maintenance,
20 maintenance, maintenance.

21 MS. TRIBE: So ensure that the critical need
22 for maintenance is emphasized.

23 Build into every alternative visitor use cost.

24 MS. PAHL: That's the other question. Is
25 that a do-over or is that -- what is that?

1 MS. LEWIS: We now have it. Joe presented it
2 to you this morning. So I think, actually, that one will be
3 taken care of by the fact that you just said that we would
4 incorporate all the funding. So that one, actually, is
5 eliminated. Because we said he presented visitor cost
6 information this morning that will now go back and put into
7 your document.

8 MR. O'QUINN: So it doesn't need to be there.

9 MS. LEWIS: And it will be an addendum to
10 this one.

11 MS. STEWART: So scratch it.

12 MS. TRIBE: So, we already did it, is what
13 we're saying.

14 Now, the last one here is be aggressive about the
15 shuttle system. Now, I'm kind of confused about shuttle.
16 Does shuttle exclude the red buses, or does that -- do you
17 consider that shuttle?

18 MS. LEWIS: The red buses are historic
19 restoring vehicles. They are not shuttle vehicles, they are
20 not transportation function. While they serve that
21 function, their main purpose is to provide a historic
22 touring experience in the Park. That it will take you from
23 which point A to point B in terms of the tour you pick. But
24 the experience is heritage tourism and not transportation.

25 MS. TRIBE: So they're not included in that.

1 So when you talked about transit this morning, you were
2 talking about --

3 MR. KRACUM: Vans and buses.

4 MS. TRIBE: So be aggressive about shuttle
5 systems, that means that in the EIS be aggressive.

6 MR. BAKER: Is that not already reiterated a
7 couple times in our common element and so on?

8 MS. TRIBE: It is in there. I think they
9 just wanted to make sure.

10 MR. JEWETT: I brought this one up, and it is
11 put in there, Brian. This is a personal interest, because I
12 think it makes sense, but it also is an example of a way of
13 driving new alternatives. This being one. Which is that in
14 the documents, you'll see that the statement is made by the
15 consultants that if you were to reduce volume on the road by
16 10 percent, you would significantly relieve congestion and
17 realize significant savings. And yet, the most aggressive
18 transit target that is in here is what, 5 percent?
19 Something like that. So my point is we have a chance to
20 develop an alternative that greatly reduces cost, may
21 shorten the time to do it, and we're not even by just doing
22 this, we're not looking at it.

23 MS. TRIBE: So, Tony, I changed the words
24 here a little bit.

25 MR. BAKER: Just as long -- and I have a real

1 fear -- just as long as the transportation issue does not
2 override the rehabilitation of the Sun Road in general.
3 Because, you know, I read about what's happening in Grand
4 Canyon, et cetera, how the transportation issues are
5 overwhelming what's happening in the park. And I just
6 wouldn't want the transportation issue to take center stage
7 over the actual rehabilitation of the road. And if they
8 start bringing those two issues together, I think it could
9 jeopardize maybe funding, could extend out -- I just -- I
10 don't know quite how to explain it.

11 MS. TRIBE: I think if this was our first
12 meeting and we were starting to talk about what would be in
13 there, then I think there might be a danger of us getting
14 off balance. But we are at the end of the process. We've
15 agreed on the things -- as a matter of fact, common elements
16 list the exploration of a shuttle system. And so what -- I
17 changed the words here a little bit that you wrote, Joni.
18 Instead of "Develop an aggressive shuttle system," I said
19 "Explore an aggressive shuttle system," because "explore" is
20 all they can do in the EIS anyway. They have to make a
21 decision and fund it afterwards. We cannot tell them to
22 develop it. So all this does is reinforce what's already
23 there in the common elements, and particularly in
24 Alternative 5.

25 MR. O'QUINN: What does the General

1 Management Plan say about shuttle systems?

2 MS. LEWIS: General Management Plan affirms
3 that private vehicles will continue to be used on the
4 Going-to-the-Sun Road and that transportation systems would
5 be used to supplement and try to reduce -- brought in as
6 visitation. The thought being, as visitation increases, in
7 order to reduce congestion and reduce wear and tear on the
8 road. But the plan is pretty specific that your ability to
9 drive your private vehicle was reaffirmed, resoundingly, in
10 this General Management Plan.

11 But it does -- the General Management Plan leads
12 us to talk and look at doing specific planning relating to
13 transportation and how can we bring that on, introduce it in
14 the Park in order not to wait to where we're in a crisis
15 situation like the Grand Canyon or Yosemite Valley, if the
16 Park were to experience a tremendous increase in visitation
17 in a short amount of time.

18 MR. O'QUINN: The question is -- I understand
19 the use of the red buses, whether they are the historic
20 buses or that concept what you're using with the vans now.
21 I don't understand, with the Park being the way it is, what
22 you mean by transit, other than a tour.

23 MR. JEWETT: The point I was going to -- I
24 mean, I'm less focused on the activity than I am on the
25 activity as a tool to meet the charge that we have as a

1 Committee. The documents clearly say that an aggressive
2 application of this tool will greatly reduce congestion,
3 resulting in cost savings and reduce construction time. Yet
4 we don't have an alternative that employs that tool. My
5 point isn't let's take out all the cars and put in a transit
6 system. My point is, let's use the information to develop
7 alternatives to get where we're at, and this one hasn't been
8 used.

9 MR. O'QUINN: What I'm a little confused on
10 is when you say transit system. It usually think I'm going
11 from point A to point B and getting off. In this whole
12 list, when you're talking about a person visiting
13 Going-to-the-Sun Road utilizing public transportation of
14 some sort as their means of seeing it as a tourist
15 experience, not as just transportation.

16 MR. JEWETT: Yes. I think 34, 40 percent of
17 the people that returned that survey said they'd be willing
18 to take a shuttle up to the top of Logan Pass.

19 MS. TRIBE: I'm going to interrupt Barney and
20 Tony and just say a couple things. The hard fact is the
21 Glacier National Park already did its management plan. In
22 that, I just heard you say that it affirms use of private
23 vehicles, but it also considers the use of some kind of
24 transit within that. Okay.

25 The second thing I want to say is that last time

1 we made a decision that we would include the exploration of
2 shuttle in the common elements. We've already agreed to
3 that. I don't want to reopen that whole business again.

4 All we're trying to agree on is this group
5 recommended that we simply are reinforcing what's already in
6 there about exploring an aggressive shuttle system as a tool
7 in completing the reconstruction. And Joe presented this
8 morning already a -- already a -- Joe completed -- or
9 presented this morning, already, some costs related to
10 transit. And so somewhere within there, may not be as
11 aggressive as Tony's looking at. Barney, you may think it
12 doesn't belong there at all.

13 MR. O'QUINN: I think it's terminology. It's
14 not a shuttle system. A shuttle system gets you from the
15 airport to the hotel. This is a touring system.

16 MS. LEWIS: No, it's a shuttle system.

17 MR. O'QUINN: From where to where?

18 MS. STEWART: Part of the discussion was to
19 get rid of some of the day hikers, the overnight hikers. If
20 there was a shuttle system to pick them up when they came
21 out of there, then we don't need all of their cars up there.

22 MS. PAHL: Yeah.

23 MS. TRIBE: That's all we're talking about.
24 Is a broader kind of transit approach.

25 So can we live with this? Are you all right?

1 Then over here, last one. Last one, this is 7.
2 With the exception of the Charter wording, the legal casting
3 of the Charter that uses the word "reconstruction," this
4 group is asking that rehabilitation be kind of explained and
5 reinforced at the very beginning of the recommendations so
6 that we sort of support the importance of rehabing the road
7 and kind of going to Barney's comments this morning about
8 what this kind of project really is.

9 Any problem?

10 Nice job ladies and gentlemen. Give yourself
11 another hand.

12 (Applause.)

13 MS. TRIBE: Did you have any things you
14 wanted to do with these folks before they left?

15 MR. BLACK: Don't open that up.

16 MS. STEWART: Could we have some closure?

17 MS. ANDERSON: Don't use the word "close."

18 MS. PAHL: Is there a way we can formally
19 make a motion to thank our Chair, Randy Ogle, for the
20 fabulous job?

21 MS. TRIBE: Why don't you make that motion.

22 MS. PAHL: I would look to move and have the
23 support of the Committee to acknowledge and thank our Chair,
24 Randy, for the fabulous job he did in assuming the
25 chairmanship of this Committee. That was a very big job.

1 (Standing ovation by Committee members.)

2 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Thanks very much. I do have
3 something that I wanted to share with the Committee, if I
4 could. So if I could ask these ladies to help me hand these
5 out.

6 MR. DAKIN: That may have been the best
7 decision we made.

8 MS. PAHL: I do think so.

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: There should be enough for
10 everyone. I wanted to thank you all for all of your efforts
11 you put in and just give a little gift and a little memento
12 to remember this experience by.

13 What this is is a reproduction of Logan Pass and
14 the Logan Creek. It's a piece that was done by my wife and
15 her partner, Karen Lee. And then you'll see on the back a
16 quote by Margaret Mead. Did everybody get one?

17 And I think one, it's kind of a remembrance of the
18 Park from this experience. And secondly, I think the quote
19 on the back about the efforts made by small groups of people
20 can sometimes make a difference. And I just wanted to share
21 this with you as a remembrance of this Committee and thank
22 you all for your hard work and for your effort here. I also
23 have one for Suzann.

24 And I would also like to say a special note of
25 thanks to Mary and Dayna here. They -- and I had one for

1 Fred too. We could not have gotten through this process
2 without all of their hard work, above and beyond the call of
3 duty, oftentimes doing work in the middle of our meetings.
4 And I don't think we could have finished this without them,
5 and also to Virginia. Where is Virginia? It's a good thing
6 we brought her in here. We wouldn't have been able to get
7 through all this work without her. So thanks very much to
8 everybody.

9 (Applause.)

10 MS. LEWIS: Well, I too have something that
11 weighs a little bit more that needs to be handed out.

12 But it's very important to me to be able to share
13 with you sort of some closing issues on my part. I've had
14 the privilege of working for the National Park Service for
15 over twenty-two years now. And one of the greatest aspects
16 of that privilege is always how we involve the citizens in
17 the decisions that we're making and the efforts that we put
18 forward on your behalf, as well as our own, because we too
19 are citizens of the United States, to do the right thing by
20 our parks, to preserve and protect the resources.

21 I think all of you have demonstrated what all of
22 us have come to have, I think, a little bit more thought
23 about since September 11th. And that is the wonder and the
24 joy of democracy that we enjoy in this country. And from
25 democracy it does mean diversity. It means diversity of

1 opinion, diversity of viewpoints and being able to open your
2 arms and your minds wide enough to accept that diversity,
3 take it into full and thorough consideration and then move
4 forward with a decision.

5 I think some of you have been appalled at the
6 bureaucracy that goes into one of these but at the same time
7 maybe a little enlightened as a citizen that you know how
8 hard each one of you worked. You know how much time and
9 effort you gave to this, how you sort of stayed with it
10 through two years, sort of through thick and thin. We had
11 some thick moments, we had some thin moments. But,
12 certainly, you know what you gave to it. And I would not
13 speak for you, but my guess is that some of you would want,
14 in some way, that all citizens have an opportunity to
15 participate like this in their government. It makes us
16 better for what we do. It doesn't always ensure the
17 absolute right and only answer is arrived at, but it sure
18 does give credibility to our desire, as a democratic nation,
19 to listen to all viewpoints before we make the decision.

20 So I thank you for bringing that to this process.
21 I thank you for allowing us to participate in it. I think
22 it helps us grow as an agency, and it certainly helps us
23 grow in how we work with the public. You've given us a
24 solid foundation to this process being based in public
25 participation. You've ensured that through your own

1 participation, how you've conducted yourself at these
2 meetings and how we've had these meetings set up allowing
3 other members of the public to come in and address you. So
4 again, I thank you. I am impressed by your work.

5 This is the fourth Advisory Committee I've worked
6 with during my career. These are rare now in government.
7 They used to be the order of the day back in the late '70s
8 and the early '80s, but we're seeing less and less of these
9 advisory committees being set up by Congress and appointed
10 by the Secretary. So I thank you very much for your work,
11 and I too have something for you that needs to be handed
12 out.

13 MS. TRIBE: Well, Barney, here comes the
14 kissing and hugging part.

15 MR. O'QUINN: Oh, Lord.

16 (Barney and Barbara hug.)

17 MS. TRIBE: We already blew our time, so I'm
18 going to blow seven more minutes. I want to start here with
19 Brian. Could you please turn to the person to your left and
20 just, very briefly, one sentence, tell Barney what you
21 appreciated about his contribution to this process. Very
22 quickly go right around. Last person is Randy to Brian, and
23 then if you will close the meeting. I'm not in the circle.

24 MR. BAKER: Barney, it's been a pleasure
25 working with you, and I've learned amazing things on

1 engineering aspects of mountain roads and your unique
2 perspective that you've given us. And you've overcome the
3 language barrier. Thank you very much.

4 MR. O'QUINN: Thank you.

5 And Joni, I think that you came in late in the
6 game and came up real fast and got very involved, and I
7 appreciate your efforts there.

8 MS. STEWART: And Jayne, I really appreciated
9 your agreeableness and good humoredness. It's been very
10 positive. Thank you.

11 MS. KREMENIK: Don, I've really appreciated
12 your perspective over the course of the last two years, and
13 I wanted to thank you for that and being patient with us and
14 the understanding perspective.

15 MR. WHITE: Anna Marie, I appreciate working
16 with you, to meeting you, find out a little bit more about
17 Travel Montana and tourism and the importance of it and hope
18 to work with you in the future.

19 MS. MOE: Barb, I appreciate you being able
20 to stand up for what you believe in but also able to say
21 what your points are and agree to disagree and move on
22 towards a common ground.

23 MS. PAHL: Tom, I appreciate that you've come
24 here and helped represent the views of the Salish and
25 Kootenai Tribes in this process and the reminder also of

1 natural resource consideration issues.

2 MR. MCDONALD: Roscoe, I want to know where
3 your vacation is. I appreciate obviously you're dedicated
4 to this issue and protecting the concerns of the industry
5 that you obviously represent and brought forward, good ideas
6 and it's been a pleasure to know you.

7 MR. BLACK: Thank you.

8 Well, I'm so glad we had a bean counter to keep us
9 focused on those details. You did a great job bringing out
10 the things that all of us were looking at and going Gosh,
11 what does this mean? Really appreciate it. And I think
12 it's great that a New Yorker can embrace what's going on
13 here in Montana as strongly as you have. So thank you very
14 much for your input.

15 MR. JACKSON: Well, thank you. I'm a
16 naturalized Montanan, but that doesn't count much.

17 Susie, I really appreciate, first of all, knowing
18 you and, secondly, you're the one that can really write
19 well. I mean, we can all realize that's important. And you
20 really have a good knack of kind of getting the language
21 together so we can reach agreement, and that's really
22 critical to what we did here today. If it weren't for that,
23 actually two of you, with those sentences there, we'd still
24 be struggling, I think, into the wee hours. So thanks a
25 lot.

1 MS. BURCH: Tony, it's been a pleasure
2 meeting you. I've appreciated your wit, your keen insights
3 and worthy perspective. Thank you very much.

4 MR. JEWETT: Thank you.

5 Bill, the thoughtfulness that you have delivered,
6 your perspectives and the timeliness of it, I think, has
7 been very useful in a constructive dimensions entire process
8 that we've gone through and I really appreciate that.

9 Secondly, you brought a history to our Committee
10 as an individual who has deep roots in this Park and in a
11 lot of different ways.

12 MR. DAKIN: Like an old tamarack.

13 MR. JEWETT: That's like. Like an old
14 tamarack. And that has been really fun to learn from.

15 And lastly, as a person who has moved to Montana
16 to call it my home, it's always enjoyable to see native
17 Montanans who retain the same values that I have in trying
18 to keep this place the way it is. And I appreciated getting
19 to know you that way too.

20 MR. DAKIN: Thank you.

21 Let's just do the hugging. Well, you are just
22 terrific. I think your people that you represent are really
23 lucky to have such an enthusiastic, up-beat articulate
24 spokesperson. You always bring up kind of lighthearted
25 Let's-get-the-job-done attitude, and I've always looked

1 forward to seeing you at all of these. Thanks for
2 everything.

3 MS. ANDERSON: And before I say thank you to
4 Lowell, I'm going to do this out of order, but I wanted to
5 say thank you to Joe and to Jean. Because many times I've
6 called or we've E-mailed or we've talked about some of these
7 things, if we needed clarification or whatever, and they've
8 always come up to bat. And so I wanted to say thank you to
9 both of you.

10 (Applause.)

11 MS. ANDERSON: And Lowell, I just want to say
12 thank you for your levelheadedness. And when you've had
13 something to say, it's always been very succinct and worth
14 listening to. We didn't hear from you as much as some of
15 the others, but I value what you have to say, and you have a
16 great smile.

17 MR. MEZNARICH: Suzann, I really appreciate
18 the welcome knowledge you brought from your career and this
19 process and the way that you carefully measured your input,
20 allowing the Committee to do its work. And I very much am
21 appreciative, will be for the rest of my life, for the
22 invitation to the hike in August of last year. Thank you.

23 MS. LEWIS: Well, Randy, I don't think it's
24 hard to thank and appreciate the Chairman. You took on a
25 yeoman's task almost two years ago, and I don't think that

1 you volunteered for it or necessarily ran around the table
2 campaigning to be named the chairman. But I think I speak
3 for the whole group in saying that they're very happy that
4 you chaired this process. Because you do represent a
5 private citizen who's not necessarily in a business that may
6 be directly or indirectly affected by the final outcome, and
7 you've done a wonderful job leading us. I always appreciate
8 anybody that will take my phone calls on a regular basis.
9 You've never refused to see me if I came down to the office,
10 and that meant a lot. I mean, we stuck with it, and I
11 really appreciate that support.

12 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Thank you.

13 Brian, I'd like to say how much I've appreciated
14 your -- first of all, bringing the perspective from our good
15 friends across the border and with your comments showing us
16 how very important the Park and the road are to Waterton and
17 the Canadian residents, as well as on this side of the
18 border. And also on your focus and your interest in keeping
19 us on task. When there was an issue of importance to you,
20 you always made sure that it was heard and that it was
21 discussed fully. And I think that was a very valuable part
22 of the process. So I appreciate those things.

23 MR. BAKER: Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think we're about there. I
25 would like to thank you all for all of your diligence here.

1 When we started this process and I saw all the different
2 factions that were represented on this Committee, I thought
3 Gee, this might be kind of a divisive group. There's a lot
4 of room for tension amongst the group. And I have been
5 amazed, frankly, and compliment all of you with the varying
6 and diverse interests that are represented on this
7 Committee. Which I also thought whoever designed the
8 Committee, the make-up of the Committee, was very well
9 thought out and did have all of the interests that are
10 impacted by the road represented. And then with the
11 diversity of the interest, the consensus that we were able
12 to achieve, almost always through our discussions, I thought
13 was just pretty amazing. And I commend you all for that and
14 thank you very much for that.

15 So I don't think we have anything more to bring
16 up. This has been a very memorable experience for me and
17 extremely educational. I hope it has been for you. And we
18 will probably be in contact at some point in the future,
19 maybe after the EIS is completed to perhaps register some
20 comments on that.

21 But in any event, it's been a pleasure working
22 with all of you, and I hope we cross paths again. And with
23 that we're adjourned. I'm reminded by Dayna that you can
24 each take your name tags with you, so that's another little
25 gift from the Park Service. Thanks; we're adjourned.

1 (Proceedings concluded and the last meeting of the
2 Going-to-the-Sun Road Advisory Committee was adjourned at
3 4:40 p.m.; Thursday, November 15, 2001.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25